arXiv:1408.3282v1 [math.LO] 25 Jun 2014

Atom–canonicity, complete representations for cylindric–like algebras, and omitting types in clique guarded fragments of $L_{\omega,\omega}$

Tarek Sayed Ahmed

August 15, 2014

Abstract

Fix a finite ordinal $n > 2$. We show that there exists an atomic, simple and countable representable CA_n, such that its Dedekind–MacNeille completion is outside $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_{n+3}$. Hence, for any finite $k \geq 3$, the variety $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_{n+k}$ is not atom–canonical, so that the variety of CA_ns having $n+k$–flat representations is not atom–canonical, too. We show, for finite $k \geq 3$, that $\mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_{n+k}$ is not elementary, hence the class of CA_ns having complete $n+3$–smooth representations is not elementary. We obtain analogous results by replacing flat and smooth, respectively, by (the weaker notion of) square; this give a stronger result in both cases and here we can allow k to be infinite. Our results are proved using rainbow constructions for CAs. We lift the negative result on atom–canonicity to the transfinite. We also show that for any ordinal $\alpha \geq \omega$, for any finite $k \geq 1$, and for any $r \in \omega$, there exists an atomic algebra $\mathfrak{A}_r \in \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathsf{CA}_{\alpha+k} \sim \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_{\alpha+k+1}$, such that $\Pi_{r/U}\mathfrak{A}_r \in \mathsf{RCA}_\alpha$, where U is any non–principal ultrafilter on ω. Reaping the harvest of our algebraic results we investigate a plethora of omitting types theorems for variants of first logic including its finite variable fragments and its packed fragment. We show that there exists a countable, consistent, atomic and complete theory T using n variables, such that the non–principal type consisting of co–atoms, cannot be omitted in $n+3$–square, a *priori*, $n+3$–flat models. This implies that the omitting types theorem fails for the clique–guarded fragment of first order logic, an alternative formulation of the packed fragment. In contrast, we show that if T is any theory using n variables such that $|T| \leq \lambda$, λ a regular cardinal, admits elimination of quantifiers, then $< 2^\lambda$ many *complete* non–principal types can be omitted in ordinary (ω–square) models having cardinality $\leq |\lambda|$. We provide an example for $|T| = 2^{\aleph_0}$, showing that the condition of completeness cannot be dispensed with. We show that the omitting types theorem fails for finite first order expansions of finite variable fragments of first order logic, as long as the number of variables available are > 2.

1 Introduction

We follow the notation of [6] which is in conformity with the notation adopted in the monograph [15]. In particular, CA_n denotes the class of cylindric algebras of dimension n, RCA_n denotes the class of representable CA_ns and for $m > n$, $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_m$ denotes the class of all n–neat reducts of CA_ms.

Three cornerstones in the development of the theory of cylindric algebras due to Tarski, Henkin and Monk, respectively - the last two involving the notion of neat reducts - are the following. Tarski proved that every locally finite infinite dimensional cylindric algebra of infinite dimension is representable. This is equivalent (in ZFC) to Gödels completeness theorem.

Henkin proved that for any ordinal n, $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_{n+\omega} = \mathsf{RCA}_\mathsf{n}$, where $\mathbf{S}$ denotes the operation of forming subalgebras. When n is infinite, this is a strong generalization of Godel's completeness theorem addressing extensions of first order logic allowing infinitary predicates.

Monk proved that for any ordinal $n > 2$ and $k \in \omega$, $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_{n+k} \neq \mathsf{RCA}_n$. In particular, for each finite $n > 2$, and $k \in \omega$, there is an algebra $\mathfrak{A}_k \in \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_{n+k}$ that is not representable. Any non–trivial ultraproduct of such algebras will be in RCA_n. Hence, the variety RCA_n $(2 < n < \omega)$ is not finitely axiomatizable. This implies that finite variable fragments of first order logic are severely incomplete, as long as the number of variables available are ≥ 3. For any finite $m > 2$, there is a valid 3–variable first order formula that needs more than m variables to be proved, in any fairly standard Hilbert–style axiomatization. Using an ingenious lifting argument [22, Theorem 3.2.87], which we henceforth refer to as *Monk's trick* (to be used several times below), Monk lifted this non–finite axiomatizability result to the transfinite.

Some queries on neat reducts: Now let K be a class consisting of cylindric–like algebras (like for instance cylindric algebras or quasi–polyadic algebras), so that for every pair of ordinals $n < m$, K_n is a variety consisting of n–dimensional algebras and for $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathsf{K}_m$, $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{B}$ and $\mathfrak{Rd}_n\mathfrak{B}$ are defined, so that the former, the *n–neat reduct* of $\mathfrak{B}$, is a subalgebra of the latter, the *n–reduct* of $\mathfrak{B}$. If $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{B}$ and $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathsf{K}_m$, then we say that $\mathfrak{A}$ *neatly embeds* in $\mathfrak{B}$, and that $\mathfrak{B}$ is an *m–dilation*, or simply a dilation of $\mathfrak{A}$, when m is clear from context.

When reflecting about neat reducts, several possible questions cannot help but spring to mind, each with its own range of intuition.

1. Is it true that every algebra neatly embeds into another algebra having only one extra dimension? having k extra dimension $k > 1$ (k possibly infinite) ? And could it, at all be possible, that an n–dimensional algebra (n an ordinal) neatly embeds into another $n + k$–dimensional one, but does not neatly embed into any $n+k+1$–dimensional algebra for some $k \in \omega$?

2. Assume that $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{K}_n$ neatly embeds into $\mathfrak{B}$ having dimension $> n$, and assume further that $\mathfrak{A}$ (as a set) generates $\mathfrak{B}$, is then $\mathfrak{B}$ unique up to isomorphisms that fix $\mathfrak{A}$ pointwise? does $\mathfrak{A}$ exhaust the set of n–dimensional elements of $\mathfrak{B}$, namely, $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{B}$, the n–neat reduct of $\mathfrak{B}$? In this context $\mathfrak{B}$ is called a *minimal* dilation of $\mathfrak{A}$, because $\mathfrak{A}$ generates $\mathfrak{B}$.

3. If $2 < n < m \cap \omega$, and $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{K}_n$ neatly embeds into $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathsf{K}_m$; does this induce some form of 'concrete representation' of $\mathfrak{A}$ using the spare dimensions of the m–dilation $\mathfrak{B}$? We know it does when $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{CA}_n$ and $m = \omega$, that is when $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathsf{CA}_\omega$. This gives a classical representation by Henkin's aforementioned *neat embedding theorem*. But when $n < m < \omega$, does this perhaps give some kind of an m *localized form of representation* that is an 'm approximation' to a classical representation? Could such relativized representations, if any, diffuse negative undesirable properties of the classical ones, for example is it decidable to tell whether a finite algebra possesses such a relativized representation?

4. Now that we have, for every pair of ordinals $n < m$, the class $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_m$ in front of us, there is a pressing need to classify it. For example, is it a variety, if not, is it elementary, if not,

is it perhaps pseudo–elementary and if so, is its elementary theory recursively enumerable, finitely axiomatizable?

5. Let $n < m$ be ordinals. Now we address the varieties $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_m$ and the classes $\mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_m$, where $\mathbf{S}_c$ denotes the operation of forming *complete* subalgebras:

   - What do we know about the varieties $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_m$? Are they finitely axiomatizable? are they canonical, atom–canonical? are they closed under Dedekind–MacNeille completions, hence, being conjugated, they are Sahlqvist axiomatizable? These are important questions addressing the modal formalism of the corresponding logic; that is, the multi n–dimensional modal logic, whose modal algebras are in $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_m$. What are the possible 'natural' semantics for such a logic?
   - What do we know about the classes $\mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_m$? Are they elementary classes? A limiting case, when $n < \omega$, is the class of completely representable K_ns, which is not elementary [18].

     Can we characterize (complete) *relativized* representations, if any, for $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_m(\mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_m)$ when $n < m < \omega$, by games similar to usual atomic games [22, Definition 3.3.2], if we perhaps limit the number of pebbles and /or rounds used in the play, to finitely many?

6. Related to the two previous items: What are the impact of such results, if any, on meta–logical properties of finite variable fragments of first order logic and its modal formalism, like, say, definability issues, completeness and omitting types?

Some answers: Henceforth in the introduction we focus on CAs. Once vexing outstanding problems in (algebraic) logic, some of such questions for finite dimensions were settled by the turn of the millennium, and others a few years later, after thorough dedicated trials, and dozens of publications providing partial answers.

Now let us review the present status of such questions; which are settled, which are not, and also those questions whose naswers lend themselves to further natural generalizations that enriches the hitherto obtained answers providing new insights and opening new avenues.

Concerning the second question, it is known that minimal dilations may not be unique up to isomorphisms that fix $\mathfrak{A}$ pointwise. For an intense discussion of this rather anti–intuitive phenomena the reader is referred to [27] where a somewhat convoluted proof is given depending on a strong result of Pigozzi's, namely that RCA_ω does not have the amalgmation property. Below we give a more straightforward proof, exhibiting explicity such an $\mathfrak{A}$. Infinitely many examples are given.

It is now known that for finite $n \geq 3$ and $k \geq 1$, the variety $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_{n+k+1}$ is not even finitely axiomatizable over $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_{n+k}$; this was proved by Hirsch, Hodkinson and Maddux, answering problem 2.12 in [15].

This refines considerably Monk's seminal result. It implies that for any finite $m > 2$, there is a 3–variable formula (using only one binary relation, a significant addition) that cannot be proved using m variables, but it *can* be proved using $m + 1$ variables. Monk's result does not tell us more than the obvious fact - baring in mind that proofs are finite strings of formulas and formulas contain only finitely many variables - that this 3 variable formula (that cannot be proved using m variables), can be proved using $m + k$ variables, for some finite $k \geq 1$, that we do not have any control whatsoever on. In Monk's (algebraic) proof this k depends on a large uncontrollable Ramsey number.

This result was lifted to infinite dimensions, using Monk's trick, by Robin Hirsch and the present author [23], addressing other cylindric–like algebras, as well, like Pinter's substitution algebras and Halmos' quasi–polyadic algebras. This also answers the first part of item (5). The rest of the questions in this item are answered negatively by Hodkinson for finite $n > 2$ and $m = \omega$ [24]. Below we will sharpen Hodkinson's result by showing that:

(*) The variety $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_{n+k}$ is not atom–canonical, for any ordinal $n > 2$, and for any $k \geq 3$.

This will be done by a constructing a representable countable atomic $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{CA}_n$, such that $\mathfrak{Cm}\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A} \notin \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_{n+3}$, providing an answer to the first half of item (6). For the second part, non–elementarity is known for $m = \omega$ [21], from which we can easily deduce that there must be a finite $l < n$, such that $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_m$ is not elementary for all $m \geq l$. To determine the least such l, is a challenging open problem. For this l it must be the case that $\mathsf{StrS}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_l = \{\mathfrak{F} \in \mathsf{AtCA}_n : \mathfrak{Cm}\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{F} \in \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_l\}$ is propery contained in $\mathsf{AtS}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_l$. We prove this necessary (but not sufficient) condition for $l \geq n + 3$. In this connection, we also re-prove a result of Bulian and Hirsch [11] extending the result in [21] to many cylindric–like algebras, including diagonal free CAs, polyadic equality algebras, and, in fact, for any class in between these two classes, like for instance the class of Pinter's substitution algebras.

We will see that the semantics appropriate for the 'modal algebras' in $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_m$ for $2 < n < m < \omega$, are what we call following Hirsch and Hodkinson for analogous results on relation algebras, *n-clique–guarded semantics*, or *n–Gaifman hypergraph semantics*. Such semantics are like classical semantics but only locally on 'm squares'. Roughly, if we zoom in adequately by a 'movable window', there will come a point, determined by m, where we mistake this severely relativized representation for a genuine one.

Concerning the fourth question, it is now also known that for $1 < n < m$, the class $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_m$ is not first order definable, least a variety, hence it is not pseudo–universal, but for $n < \omega$, it is pseudo–elementary, and its elementary theory is recursively enumerable. All these results are due to the present author, the last two are proved below. The first refines Németi's answer to problem 2.11 in [15] and answers 4.4 in [15]. Now fix n with $2 < n < \omega$. A natural variant of the class $\mathbf{K} = \{\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{CA}_n : \mathfrak{Cm}\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{RCA}_n\}$, proved to be non–elementary in [21] (this is equivalent to non-elementarity of StrRCA_n is not elementary), is the class $\mathbf{N} = \{\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{CA}_n : \mathfrak{A}$ is atomic and $\mathfrak{Cm}\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A} \in \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega\}$.

This class is properly contained in $\mathbf{K}$; it will be shown that there is a countable atomic algebra $\mathfrak{C} \in \mathsf{CA}_n$ such that $\mathfrak{Cm}\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{C} \in \mathsf{RCA}_n \sim \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega$; and there is a countable atomic $\mathfrak{B} \notin \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega$, such that $\mathfrak{Cm}\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{B} \in \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega$ so that $\mathfrak{B}$ in $\mathbf{N} \sim \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega$.

We also show that the classes $\mathbf{N}$, $\mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega$, and the class of completely representable CA_ns coincide on atomic algebras having countably many atoms. Finally, we show that, like both of $\mathbf{K}$ and $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega$:

(**) The class $\mathbf{N}$ is not closed under ultraroots, hence is not elementary.

Concerning the fifth, we show that:

(***) For $2 < n < \omega$ and finite $k \geq 3$, the class $\mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_{n+k}$, and the class of completely representable CA_ns are also not elementary, substantially generalizing the result in [18].

Games devised to characterize the *complete* n-clique–guarded semantics for such classes will be devised below.

The remaining items, namely, (3) and (6) will be for their part addressed as the paper unfolds. First, the answer is known for the limiting cases [25, 18]. In the former reference, it is proved that $2 < n < \omega$, it is undecidable to tell whether a finite CA_n has a (classical) representation.

One of our results connects these two items. We will show that, for finite $n > 2$, the Orey–Henkin omitting types theorem fails for first order logic restricted to the first n variables (L_n), even if allow severely relativized models. There is a countable, atomic, L_n theory, such that the single non–principal type consisting of co–atoms cannot be omitted in $n+k$–smooth models; $n+k$–smoothness provides semantics for $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_{n+k}$ for any $k \geq 3$. This result will follow from (*) and (**): Both imply that there are countable and atomic $\mathsf{RCA_n}$s that have no complete $n+3$–flat representations. In the case of (*) the constructed algebra is simple, giving that T can further be chosen to be a complete theory. In fact, this non–principal type of co–atoms cannot be omitted, even if we allow $n+k$–square models ($k \geq 3$). This readily implies that the omitting types theorem fails for the clique guarded fragment of first order logic, an alternative formulation of the packed fragment.

Both (*), (**) (***) are proved using games to be described shortly, played on (distinct) rainbow cylindric–like atom structures. The class of m–square models for finite $m > n$ is a strictly and substantially larger class than the class of m–flat ones. In fact, m–square representations provide semantics for an abstract variety $\mathsf{V} = \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_\mathsf{n}\mathbf{K}_\mathsf{m}$, where commutativity of cylindrifiers may fail in the m–dilations (in $\mathbf{K}_m$) of $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{V}$. In case of polyadic equality algebras, $\mathbf{K}_m$ is not so abstract, it is the variety $\mathsf{G_m}$ studied by Ferenczi [14]. The variety of modal algebras $\mathsf{G_m}$ manifest nice modal behaviour, e.g. it is finitely axiomatizable, and it has the finite algebra finite base property.

For finite dimensions, squareness behaves better as far as decidability issues are concerned. For example, it is decidable to tell for $2 < n < m < \omega$, whether an n–dimensional finite algebra has an m–square representation in polynomial time, cf. [19, Corollary, 12.32], but this is not true for n–flatness when $n = 3$ and $m \geq n + 3$. But in any case this discrepancy between squareness and flatness disappears at the limit. Classical models are ω–square. Algebraically, algebras having ω–square representations are representable, though this might fail for *complete* ω–square representations. For finite $n > 2$, uncountable (representable) algebras of dimension n having ω–square representations, without having (classical) complete representations, can (and will be) be constructed. This, however, cannot happen for atomic agebras having countably many atoms. As far as the omitting types theorem is concerned for L_n, $2 < n < \omega$, there is no discrepancy between m– squareness and m–flatness, when $m \geq n + 3$. It fails dramatically for both. (In principal, it could hold for 'squareness' but not for 'flatness').

Games: Now fix the dimension n to be finite > 2. Let $\mathfrak{A}$ be an atomic CA_n. An *atomic network* over $\mathfrak{A}$ is a map $N : {}^n\Delta \to \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$, where Δ is a finite non–empty set of nodes, denoted by $\mathsf{nodes}(N)$. Being basically a finite approximation to a representation, N has to satisfy certain local consistency properties:

If $x \in {}^n\mathsf{nodes}(N)$, and $i < j < n$, then $N(x) \leq \mathsf{d}_{ij}$ iff $x_i = x_j$. If $x, y \in {}^n\mathsf{nodes}(N)$, $i < n$ and $x \equiv_i y$, then $N(x) \leq \mathsf{c}_i N(y)$. An atomic game can be played on atomic networks of an atomic algebra $\mathfrak{A}$. It has ω rounds. Suppose that we are at round $t > 0$. Then $\forall$ picks a previously played network N_t, $i < n$, $a \in A$, $x \in {}^n\mathsf{nodes}(N_t)$, such that $N_t(x) \leq \mathsf{c}_i a$. For her response, $\exists$ has to deliver a network M such that $M \equiv_i N$, and there is $y \in {}^n\mathsf{nodes}(M)$ that satisfies $y \equiv_i x$, and $M(y) = a$. The k–rounded game is denoted by G_k [22, Definition 3.3.2]. A winning strategy for $\exists$ in the k–rounded game can be coded in a first order sentence ρ_k called kth Lyndon condition. If $\exists$ has a winning strategy in all k–rounded games, so that $\mathfrak{A} \models \rho_k$, then $\mathfrak{A}$ is representable, in fact

it is elementary equivalent to an algebra that is completely representable; on the atom structure of this algebra $\exists$ can win the ω–rounded game.

In response to questions (6) and (7), we devise 'truncated versions' F^m, G^m_ω of the above games. These games have ω rounds, but the number of nodes used during the play is limited to m where $2 < n < m$. In F^m, $\forall$ has the bonus to reuse the m pebbles in play. When $m \geq \omega$, these games reduce to the usual ω–rounded atomic game described above. Such games test the semantical notion of the existence of *complete m–relativized* representations and the syntactical one of the existence of m–dilations for an algebra $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{CA}_n$, for which $\mathfrak{A}$ *completely* embeds into (in the sense that suprema are preserved). A completeness theorem (to be proved below) tells us that these two notions are equivalent: For $2 < n < m < \omega$, $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{CA}_n$ has a complete m–relativized representation $\iff$ it has an m–dilation $\mathfrak{D}$, so that $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D}$ and furthermore, for all $X \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$, $\sum^{\mathfrak{D}} X = 1 \implies \sum^{\mathfrak{B}} X = 1$.

We will show that if $\forall$ has a winning strategy in F^m for $m < \omega$, played on atomic networks of an atomic algebra $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{CA}_n$, then $\mathfrak{A}$ does not have a complete m–flat representation, and if he wins G^n_ω, $\mathfrak{A}$ does not have a complete n–square one. If $\mathfrak{A}$ is finite, then we can delete complete.

We will use these games to prove three of our main results. The statements (*) and (***) are proved in the second and third items of theorem 5.1, and (**) is proved in theorem 6.5.

For (*): A finite rainbow algebra $\mathfrak{D} \in \mathsf{CA}_n$, on which $\exists$ can win G^{n+3}_ω on its atom structure (in finitely many rounds) so that $\mathfrak{D} \notin \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_{n+3}$, least representable, will be embedded in the Dedekind–MacNeille completion of a representable atomic (infinite) countable $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{CA}_n$. From this, we conclude that $\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A} \notin \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_{n+3}$, because $\mathfrak{D} \subseteq \mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$, and so $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_{n+k}$ is not atom–canonical for all $k \geq 3$. Indeed, $\mathfrak{A} \in \bigcap_{k\geq 3} \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_{n+k}$, but $\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A} \notin \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_{n+k}$ for any $k \geq 3$. So although $\mathfrak{A}$ has an ordinary (ω–square) representation, its Dedekind–MacNeille completion $\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$ does not have even an $n+3$–square one.

For (**) and (***): We start by (***). We construct, for any finite $n > 2$, an atomic rainbow algebra $\mathfrak{C} \in \mathsf{RCA}_\mathsf{n}$ with countably many atoms, on which $\forall$ can win the ω–rounded game F^{n+3} (in the graph rainbow game [18] using and re-using $n+3$ nodes), and $\exists$ can win G_k for all finite k of the same game. It will follow that $\mathfrak{C}$ does not have a complete $n+3$–flat representation. Using ultrapowers followed by an elementary chain argument, we get that $\mathfrak{C}$ is elementary equivalent to a countable completely representable algebra $\mathfrak{B}$, so that $\mathfrak{B}$ has a complete $k > n$ flat representation for all k, implying that the class of algebras having complete $\geq n+k$–flat representations, for any $k \geq 3$, is not elementary.

Furthermore, we show that $\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{B} \in \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega$, so that $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathbf{N}$. Now we have $\mathfrak{C} \equiv \mathfrak{B}$ and $\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{C}$. Therefore $\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{C} \notin \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega$, for else (having countably many atoms), $\mathfrak{C}$ will be completely representable, *a fortiori,* it will have a complete $n+3$–flat representation. Wrapping up we get: $\mathfrak{C} \equiv \mathfrak{B}$, $\mathfrak{C} \notin \mathbf{N}$ and $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathbf{N}$, from which it readily follows that that $\mathbf{N}$ is not elementary, too.

Notions of representability via neat embeddings: We continue to fix finite $n > 2$. The chapter [22] is devoted to studying the following inclusions between various types of atom structures:

$$\mathsf{CRCA}_n \subseteq \mathsf{LCA}_n \subseteq \mathsf{SRCA}_n \subseteq \mathsf{WRCA}_n.$$

The first is the class of completely representable atom structures, the second is the class of atom structures satisfying the Lyndon conditions, the third is the class of strongly representable atom

structures, and the last is the class of weakly representable atom structures, all of dimension n. It is shown in [22] that all inclusions are proper.

Now one can lift such notions from working on atom structures (the frame level) to working on the algebra level restricting his attension to atomic ones. The class of atomic CA_ns that satisfies the Lyndon conditions is an elementary class (by definition) that is not finitely axiomatizable. It is contained properly in the class of representable algebras and it contains properly the class of completely representable algebras; in fact, it is the elementary closure of the last class. If $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{CA}_n$ satisfies the Lyndon conditions, then so does its Dedekind–MacNeille completion. In particular, $\mathfrak{Cm}\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$ is representable, too. So call an atomic algebra *strongly representable* if $\mathfrak{Cm}\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$ is representable. It turns out that for finite dimension > 2, not all atomic representable algebras are strongly representable; in fact this last class is not even elementary [22].

Call an atomic CA_n *weakly representable*, if it is just representable. There are algebras that are weakly but not strongly representable, because the former class is obviously elementary. The class of completely representable algebra coincide with $\mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega$ on atomic algebra having countably many atoms [28, 27].

By definition, the class of weakly representable algebras coincides with the class $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega$ on atomic algebras. However, below we will construct for each $2 < n \leq \omega$, an atomic (representable) algebra in $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega$ (necessarily having uncountably many atoms), that is not completely representable. But when n is finite, any such algebra is *strongly* representable; in fact, it satisfies the Lyndon conditions. For finite dimensions > 2, there are strongly representable algebras that do not satisfy the Lyndon conditions, because the latter class is elementary, and it is contained in the non–elementary former class [22, Corollary 3.7.2].

Such notions, originally formulated for atom structures of cylindric algebras, are studied extensively in [22]. It is tempting therefore to investigate such various notions of representability, lifted to the algebra level in connection to neat embedding properties, baring in mind that Henkin's neat embedding theorem characterizes the class of *all* representable algebras. In this paper, we initiate this task, which is likely to be rewarding, but by no means do we end it.

To conclude: We know that Hilbert style axiomatizations for n–variable fragments of first order logic, using only m variables, are severely incomplete wih respect to square Tarskian semantics, but m–relativized models produce a perfect match between (this restricted) syntax and semantics. This match, however, no longer holds, when we require that such locally relativized representations preserve certain infinitary meets.

We learn from the results in this paper, that for $2 < n < \omega$, negative properties that hold for RCA_n, like non–finite axiomatizability, non-atom–canonicity, and non–elementarity of the class of completely representable CA_ns, persist to hold for CA_ns having m–dilations, when m is finite $\geq n + 3$, equipped with m–relativized (complete) representations, and from our seemingly pure algebraic results, we infer that the omitting types theorem fails for (an alternative formulation of) the packed fragment of first order logic.

Very little has been said about the infinite dimensional case. Results involving notions like atom–canonicity, Dedekind–MacNeille completions, complete representations for the infinite dimensional case, are extremely rare in algebraic [22, Problem 3.8.3]; in fact, almost non–existent. In this paper, we also pursue the adventurous endeavor of saying a little bit more, by stepping in the territory of the transfinite. As sample, we show that RCA_ω cannot be axiomatized by Sahqlvist equations.

Due to the length of the paper, it is divided into two parts. Roughly in the present first part we do the algebra and in the second part we do the logic using 'bridge theorems' from results in

the first part to results in the second part. In the first part all most of our results address *both* finite and infinite dimensional algebras. In the second part we deal only with finite dimensional algebras.

2 Preliminaries:

Basic notation: For a set X, $\wp(X)$ denotes the set of all subsets of X, i.e. the powerset of X. Ordinals will be identified with the set of smaller ordinals. In particular, for finite n, $n = \{0, \dots, n-1\}$. ω denotes the least infinite ordinal which is the set of all finite ordinals. For two given sets A and B, ${}^AB$ denotes the set of functions from A to B, and $A \sim B = \{x \in A : x \notin B\}$. If $f \in {}^AB$ and $X \subseteq A$ then $f \restriction X$ denotes the restriction of f to X. We denote by $\mathsf{dom}f$ and $\mathsf{rng}f$ the domain and range of a given function f, respectively. If f, g are functions such that $\mathsf{dom}g = \mathsf{dom}f = n$, n is an ordinal, and $i \in n$, then we write $f \equiv_i g$ if f and g agree off of i, that is, $f(j) = g(j)$ for all $j \in n \sim \{i\}$.

We define composition so that the righthand function acts first, thus for given functions f, g, $f \circ g(x) = f(g(x))$, whenever the left hand side is defined, i.e when $g(x) \in \mathsf{rng}f$. For a non-empty set X, $f(X)$ denotes the image of X under f, i.e $f(X) = \{f(x) : x \in X\}$. $|X|$ denotes the cardinality of X and Id_X, or simply Id when X is clear from context, denotes the identity function on X. A set X is *countable* if $|X| \leq \omega$; if X and Y are sets then $X \subseteq_\omega Y$ denotes that X is a finite subset of Y.

Algebras will be denoted by Gothic letters , and when we write $\mathfrak{A}$ then we will be tacitly assuming that A will denote the universe of $\mathfrak{A}$. However, in some occasions we will identify (notationally) an algebra and its universe.

Cylindric-like algebras: Let n be a finite ordinal. Then PA_n (PEA_n) and Sc_n denote the classes of polyadic algebras (with equality) and Pinter's algebras of dimension n. Df_n denotes the class of diagonal free cylindric algebras of dimension n. Here the extra non–Boolean operations are just the n–cylindrifiers, so all algebras considered have a Df reduct. The standard reference for all such classes of cylindric–like algebras is [15].

If n is an infinite ordinal, then QA_n, (QEA_n) denotes the class of quasi–polyadic (equality) algebras of dimension n. These are term definitionally equivalent to $\mathsf{PA}_n(\mathsf{PEA}_n)$ for finite n, but for $n \geq \omega$, they are not quite like PA_n (PEA_n), for their signature contains only substitutions indexed by replacements and transpositions. In fact, this is a huge difference; witness Figure 1.

For any ordinal n, $\mathfrak{Rd}_{ca}\mathfrak{A}$ denotes the cylindric reduct of $\mathfrak{A}$ if it has one, $\mathfrak{Rd}_{sc}\mathfrak{A}$ denotes the Sc reduct of $\mathfrak{A}$ if it has one, and $\mathfrak{Rd}_{df}\mathfrak{A}$ denotes the reduct of $\mathfrak{A}$ obtained by discarding all the operations except for cylindrifiers. It is always the case that $\mathfrak{Rd}_{df}\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{Df}_n$.

For operators on classes of algebras, $\mathbf{S}$ stands for the operation of forming subalgebras, $\mathbf{P}$ stands for that of forming products, $\mathbf{H}$ for forming homomorphic images, $\mathbf{Up}$ for forming ultraproducts and $\mathbf{Ur}$ for forming ultraroots. The smallest elementary class containing K, namely, its elementary closure, is denoted by $\mathbf{El}\mathsf{K}$. It is known that $\mathbf{UpUr}\mathsf{K} = \mathbf{El}\mathsf{K}$. If I is a non–empty set and U is an ultrafilter over $\wp(I)$ and if $\mathfrak{A}_i$ is some structure (for $i \in I$) we write either $\Pi_{i\in I}\mathfrak{A}_i/U$ or $\Pi_{i/U}\mathfrak{A}_i$ for the ultraproduct of the $\mathfrak{A}_i$s over U.

We write $\subseteq$ for inclusion, and $\subset$ for proper inclusion. $\prod$ denotes infimum, and $\sum$ denotes (its dual) supremum. For algebras $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$ having a Boolean reduct, we write $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{B}$, if for all $X \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$, whenever $\sum^{\mathfrak{A}} X = 1$, then $\sum^{\mathfrak{B}} X = 1$. Examples of such $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$ are, when $\mathfrak{B}$ is the

class	extra operators
Df_n	$\mathsf{c}_i : i < n$
Sc_n	$\mathsf{c}_i, \mathsf{s}_i^j : i, j < n$
CA_n	$\mathsf{c}_i, \mathsf{d}_{ij} : i, j < n$
PA_n	$\mathsf{c}_i, \mathsf{s}_\tau : i < n,\ \tau \in {}^n n$
PEA_n	$\mathsf{c}_i, \mathsf{d}_{ij}, \mathsf{s}_\tau : i, j < n,\ \tau \in {}^n n$
QA_n,	$\mathsf{c}_i, \mathsf{s}_{[i/j]}, \mathsf{s}_{[i,j]} : i, j < n$
QEA_n	$\mathsf{c}_i, \mathsf{d}_{ij}, \mathsf{s}_i^j, \mathsf{s}_{[i,j]} : i, j < n$

Figure 1: Non-Boolean operators for the classes

Dedekind–MacNeille completion of $\mathfrak{A}$, and when $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq \mathfrak{B}$ are finite algebras. If $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq \mathfrak{B}$, we say that $\mathfrak{A}$ is dense in $\mathfrak{B}$, if for all non-zero $b \in \mathfrak{B}$, there exists a non-zero $a \in \mathfrak{A}$ such that $a \leq b$. If $\mathfrak{A}$ is dense in $\mathfrak{B}$, then $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{B}$, the converse is not true in general. A weaker form of density holds if $\mathfrak{A}$ is atomic and $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{B}$, namely, for all non-zero $b \in \mathfrak{A}$, there exists $a \in \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$ such that $a \cdot b \neq 0$.

For an algebra $\mathfrak{A}$ having a Boolean reduct, and $X \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$, we say that X *completely generates* $\mathfrak{A}$, if whenever $X \subseteq \mathfrak{A}' \subseteq_c \mathfrak{A}$, $\mathfrak{A}'$ a subalgebra of $\mathfrak{A}$, then $\mathfrak{A}' = \mathfrak{A}$. If $\mathfrak{A}$ is a CA_n, then it is always the case that $\mathfrak{Tm}\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$ ($\mathfrak{Cm}\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$) is (completely) generated by $\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$.

For a class K having a Boolean reduct, we write $\mathbf{S}_c\mathsf{K}$ for $\{\mathfrak{A} : (\exists \mathfrak{B} \in \mathsf{K})\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{B}\}$, and $\mathsf{K} \cap \mathsf{At}$ for the class of atomic algebras in K.

Let $\mathsf{K} \in \{\mathsf{Df}, \mathsf{Sc}, \mathsf{CA}, \mathsf{PA}, \mathsf{PEA}\}$ and let $m < n$ be ordinals. For $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{K}_n$, the *reduct to m dimensions* $\mathfrak{Rd}_m\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{K}_m$ is obtained from $\mathfrak{A}$ by discarding all operators with indices $m \leq i < n$. The *neat reduct to m dimensions* is the algebra $\mathfrak{Nr}_m\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{K}_m$ with universe $\{a \in \mathfrak{A} : m \leq i < n \to \mathsf{c}_i a = a\}$ where all the operators are induced from $\mathfrak{A}$ (see [15, Definition 2.6.28] for the CA case). More generally, for $\Gamma \subseteq n$ we write $\mathfrak{Nr}_\Gamma\mathfrak{A}$ for the algebra whose universe is $\{a \in \mathfrak{A} : i \in n \setminus \Gamma \to \mathsf{c}_i a = a\}$ with all the operators o of $\mathfrak{A}$ where the indicies in o is contained in Γ.

BAOs and games: A variety V of BAOs (Boolean algebras with operators) is *atom–canonical* if whenever $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{V}$ and $\mathfrak{A}$ is atomic, then the complex algebra of its atom structure, in symbols $\mathfrak{Cm}\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$ is also in V. For $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{V}$, $\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$ will denote the set of atoms of $\mathfrak{A}$ or the atom structure of $\mathfrak{A}$. Context will help to decide which one of them we mean. $\mathsf{Uf}\mathfrak{A}$ denotes the ultrafilter atom structure (frame) of $\mathfrak{A}$, based on its Stone space; we sometimes use $\mathsf{Uf}\mathfrak{A}$ for the underlying set of the Stone space, that is, the set of all Boolean ultrafilters of $\mathfrak{A}$.

If V is completely additive, then $\mathfrak{Cm}\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$ is the Dedekind–MacNeille completion of $\mathfrak{A}$. $\mathfrak{A}$ is always dense in its Dedekind–MacNeille completion and so the Dedekind–MacNeille completion of $\mathfrak{A}$ is atomic $\iff$ $\mathfrak{A}$ is atomic. Not all varieties henceforth encountered are completely additive; the varieties Sc_n and PA_n for $n > 1$, are not [10]. There are atomic algebras in Sc_n and PA_n, for any $n > 1$, that are not completely additive. Such algebras lack complete representations, since a completely representable algebra is necessarily completely additive, because sums in such an algebra are just unions.

For a variety V of BAOs, $\mathsf{StrV} = \{\mathfrak{F} : \mathfrak{Cm}\mathfrak{F} \in \mathsf{V}\}$. If V is completely additive, then $\mathsf{StrV} \subseteq \mathsf{AtV}$ because $\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{Cm}\mathfrak{F} = \mathfrak{F}$. It is always the case that AtV is elementary [19, Theorem 2.84], which might not be the case with StrV, witness eg. [22]. StrV is elementary if V is atom–canonical, because in this case we have $\mathsf{AtV} = \mathsf{StrV}$.

We will use rainbow constructions played on *atomic networks* of a rainbow cylindric–like

atom structure consisting of coloured graphs as defined in [18] (to be recalled next). A network N on an atomic PEA_n is cylindric network [22, Definition 3.3.2] satisfying the following extra consistency condition (reflecting the polyadic substitutions corresponding to transpositions), $\mathsf{s}_{[i,j]}N(\bar{x}) = N(\bar{x} \circ [i,j])$ for all $i \neq j < n$, and $\bar{x} \in {}^n\mathsf{nodes}(N)$.

The game $G_k^m(\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A})$, or simply G_k^m is the usual game played on atomic networks of an atomic algebra $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{PEA}_n$, using m nodes and having $k \leq \omega$ rounds. We write $G_k(\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A})$, or simply G_k, if $m \geq \omega$. $F^m(\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A})$ is like $G_\omega^m(\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A})$ except that $\forall$ has the option to re–use the available m nodes (pebbles). Both games are played on atomic networks using at most m nodes defined on an atomic algebra $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{PEA}_n$ say, where $\forall$ is offered one cylindrifier move. The usual atom game G_k^ω was described in the introduction. In these two games, G_k^m and F^m $(m, k \leq \omega)$, there are no moves other than the cylindrifier move. The additional polyadic 'information' is coded in the networks (via $\mathsf{s}_{[i,j]}N(\bar{x}) = N(\bar{x} \circ [i,j])$) not in the game. When $m = k = \omega$, we often write G_ω or simply G for G_k^m.

Rainbows: The most general exposition of CA rainbow constructions is given in [22, Section 6.2, Definition 3.6.9] in the context of constructing atom structures from classes of models. Our models are just coloured graphs [18].

Let A, B be two relational structures. Let $2 < n < \omega$. Then the colours used are:

- greens: g_i $(1 \leq i \leq n-2)$, g_0^i, $i \in A$,
- whites : $\mathsf{w}_i : i \leq n-2$,
- reds: r_{ij} $(i, j \in B)$,
- shades of yellow : $\mathsf{y}_S : S$ a finite subset of B or $S = B$.

A *coloured graph* is a graph such that each of its edges is labelled by the colours in the above first three items, greens, whites or reds, and some $n-1$ hyperedges are also labelled by the shades of yellow. Certain coloured graphs will deserve special attention.

Definition 2.1. Let $i \in A$, and let M be a coloured graph consisting of n nodes $x_0, \ldots, x_{n-2}, z$. We call M *an i - cone* if $M(x_0, z) = \mathsf{g}_0^i$ and for every $1 \leq j \leq n-2$, $M(x_j, z) = \mathsf{g}_j$, and no other edge of M is coloured green. $(x_0, \ldots, x_{n-2})$ is called the *base of the cone*, z the *apex of the cone* and i the *tint of the cone*.

The rainbow algebra depending on A and B, from the class $\mathbf{K}$ consisting of all coloured graphs M such that:

1. M is a complete graph and M contains no triangles (called forbidden triples) of the following types:

$$(\mathsf{g}, \mathsf{g}', \mathsf{g}^*), (\mathsf{g}_i, \mathsf{g}_i, \mathsf{w}_i) \qquad \text{any } 1 \leq i \leq n-2, \tag{1}$$

$$(\mathsf{g}_0^j, \mathsf{g}_0^k, \mathsf{w}_0) \qquad \text{any } j, k \in A, \tag{2}$$

$$(\mathsf{r}_{ij}, \mathsf{r}_{j'k'}, \mathsf{r}_{i^*k^*}) \qquad \text{unless } i = i^*,\ j = j' \text{ and } k' = k^* \tag{3}$$

and no other triple of atoms is forbidden.

2. If $a_0, \ldots, a_{n-2} \in M$ are distinct, and no edge (a_i, a_j) $i < j < n$ is coloured green, then the sequence $(a_0, \ldots, a_{n-2})$ is coloured a unique shade of yellow. No other $(n-1)$ tuples are coloured shades of yellow. Finally, if $D = \{d_0, \ldots, d_{n-2}, \delta\} \subseteq M$ and $M \restriction D$ is an i cone with apex δ, inducing the order $d_0, \ldots, d_{n-2}$ on its base, and the tuple $(d_0, \ldots, d_{n-2})$ is coloured by a unique shade y_S then $i \in S$.

Let A and B be relational structures as above. Take the set J consisting of all surjective maps $a : n \to \Delta$, where $\Delta \in \mathbf{K}$ and define an equivalence relation on this set relating two such maps iff they essentially define the same graph [18]; the nodes are possibly different but the graph structure is the same. Let At be the set of equivalences classes. We denote the equivalence class of a by $[a]$. Then define, for $i < j < n$, the accessibility relations corresponding to ijth–diagonal element, ith–cylindrifier, and substitution operator corresponding to the transposition $[i, j]$, as follows:

(1) $[a] \in E_{ij}$ iff $a(i) = a(j)$,

(2) $[a]T_i[b]$ iff $a \restriction n \smallsetminus \{i\} = b \restriction n \smallsetminus \{i\}$,

(3) $[a]S_{ij}[b]$ iff $a \circ [i, j] = b$.

This, as easily checked, defines a PEA_n atom structure. The complex PEA_n over this atom structure will be denoted by $\mathsf{PEA}_{A,B}$. The dimension of $\mathsf{PEA}_{A,B}$, always finite and > 2, will be clear from context. The game F^m lifts to a game on coloured graphs, that is like the graph games G^m_ω [18], where the number of nodes of graphs played during the ω rounded game does not exceed m, but $\forall$ has the option to re-use nodes.

Throughout the paper L_n denotes first order logic restricted to the first n variables, and $L^n_{\infty,\omega}$ denotes the n variable fragment of $L_{\infty,\omega}$ (allowing infinite conjunctions).

Layout

In what follows our investigations address cylindric–like algebras. The paper is divided into two parts. The first is completely self contained. The second is self contained modulo cross reference to lemmata 3.5, 3.6 and the main theorem 5.1 in part one.

Part 1

(1) In section 3, using ideas of Hirsch and Hodkinson, we introduce the notion of n-clique–guarded representations for a given CA_n, and we study the notion of complete representability in connection to that of neat embeddings, for both finite and infinite dimensional algebras. The main results in this section are lemmata 3.5, 3.6, to be extensively used throughout the paper, and theorems 4.2, 4.3, 4.6 and 4.12 all characterizing existence of complete representations of algebras, possibly having uncountably many atoms, in terms of neat embedding properties.

(2) Section 4 is the heart and soul of this part of the paper, and in fact it is a central theorem in the whole paper. We prove our main algebraic results, concerning non atom–canonicity for both finite and infinite dimensional algebras, and non–elementarity; in all cases for classes consisting of algebras having a neat embedding property (and clique–guarded representations). The main theorems in this section are theorems 5.1 and 6.5. Theorem 5.1 is the heart and soul of the first part of this paper. A large portion of the second part part of the paper will be devoted to working out carefully some of its metalogical consequences.

It has five items proving a diversity of results on atom–canonicity, finite axiomatizability, first order definability, of classes of algebras having a neat embedding property for both finite and infinite dimensions.

Part 2

(1) In the fifth section, we continue our investigations on connections between neat embeddings and various notions of representability. We reprove a result of Bulian and Hodkinson [11] showing that for any class K between Df nd PEA, for any $2 < n < \omega$, the class $\mathsf{StrRK_n}$ is not elementary. The rest of the results (and proofs) in this section are new, theorem 6.7. We formulate, prove and compare several theorems on completions, theorems 6.8, 6.10 and 6.11.

(2) In the last section, we apply our algebraic results obtained on non atom–canonicity and non–elementarity of various classes of algebras having a neat embedding property, to prove that various fragments of first order logic, including its finite variable fragments (together with finite first order expansions of such fragments) and its packed fragment, all fail an omitting types theorem in a strong sense. Such results are formulated and proved in theorems 7.3, 7.4, and 7.7. A positive theorem on omitting uncountably many types in L_n $(2 < n < \omega)$ theories is given in theorem 7.12.

Part one

3 Clique guarded semantics

We define what we call n-clique–guarded semantics only for CA_ns. Such notions were introduced by Hirsch and Hodkinson for relation algebras. The transfer to CAs does not involve too much subtleties, but is also not entirely straightforward. The rest of the cases (Scs, PAs, $\mathsf{PEA}s$) can be dealt with the same way. It will always be the case, unless otherwise explicitly indicated, that $1 < n < m < \omega$; n denotes the dimension.

We identify notationally a set algebra with its universe. Let M be a *relativized representation* of $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{CA}_n$, that is, there exists an injective homomorphism $f : \mathfrak{A} \to \wp(V)$ where $V \subseteq {}^nM$ and $\bigcup_{s \in V} \mathsf{rng}(s) = M$. For $s \in V$ and $a \in \mathfrak{A}$, we may write $a(s)$ for $s \in f(a)$. This notation does not refer to f, but whenever used then either f will be clear from context, or immaterial in the context. We may also write 1^M for V.

Let $\mathfrak{L}(A)^m$ be the first order signature using m variables and one n–ary relation symbol for each element of $\mathfrak{A}$. Allowing infinitary conjunctions, we denote the resulting signature taken in $L_{\infty,\omega}$ by $\mathfrak{L}(A)^m_{\infty,\omega}$.

An n–clique, or simply a clique, is a set $C \subseteq M$ such $(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}) \in V = 1^M$ for all distinct $a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} \in C$. Let

$$\mathsf{C}^m(M) = \{s \in {}^mM : \mathsf{rng}(s) \text{ is an } n \text{ clique}\}.$$

Then $\mathsf{C}^m(M)$ is called the *n–Gaifman hypergraph*, or simply Gaifman hypergraph of M, with the n–hyperedge relation 1^M. The *n-clique–guarded semantics*, or simply clique–guarded semantics, $\models_c$, are defined inductively.

Let f be as above. For an atomic n–ary formula $a \in \mathfrak{A}$, $i \in {}^nm$, and $s \in {}^mM$, $M, s \models_c a(x_{i_0}, \dots x_{i_{n-1}}) \iff (s_{i_0}, \dots s_{i_{n-1}}) \in f(a)$. For equality, given $i < j < m$, $M, s \models_c x_i = x_j \iff s_i = s_j$. Boolean connectives, and infinitary disjunctions, are defined as expected. Semantics for

existential quantifiers (cylindrifiers) are defined inductively for $\phi \in \mathfrak{L}(A)^m_{\infty,\omega}$ as follows: For $i < m$ and $s \in {}^mM$, $M, s \models_c \exists x_i \phi \iff$ there is a $t \in \mathsf{C}^m(M)$, $t \equiv_i s$ such that $M, t \models_c \phi$.

Definition 3.1. Let $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{CA}_n$, M a relativized representation of $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{L}(A)^m$ be as above.

(1) Then M is said to be *m–square*, if witnesses for cylindrifiers can be found on n–cliques. More precisely, for all $\bar{s} \in \mathsf{C}^m(M), a \in \mathfrak{A}$, $i < n$, and for any injective map $l : n \to m$, if $M \models \mathsf{c}_i a(s_{l(0)} \dots, s_{l(n-1)})$, then there exists $\bar{t} \in \mathsf{C}^m(M)$ with $\bar{t} \equiv_i \bar{s}$, and $M \models a(t_{l(0)}, \dots, t_{l(n-1)})$.

(2) M is said to be *(infinitary) m–flat* if it is m–square and for all $\phi \in (\mathfrak{L}(A)^m_{\infty,\omega})\mathfrak{L}(A)^m$, for all $\bar{s} \in \mathsf{C}^m(M)$, for all distinct $i, j < m$, we have $M \models_c [\exists x_i \exists x_j \phi \longleftrightarrow \exists x_j \exists x_i \phi](\bar{s})$.

The proof of the following lemma can be distilled from its RA analogue [19, Theorem 13.20], by reformulating deep concepts originally introduced by Hirsch and Hodkinson for RAs in the CA context, involving the notions of hypernetworks and hyperbasis. This can (and will) be done.

In the coming proof, we highlight the main ideas needed to perform such a transfer from RAs to CAs [19, Definitions 12.1, 12.9, 12.10, 12.25, Propositions 12.25, 12.27].

In all cases, the m–dimensional dilation stipulated in the statement of the theorem, will have top element $\mathsf{C}^m(M)$, where M is the m–relativized representation of the given algebra, and the operations of the dilation are induced by the n-clique–guarded semantics.

But first a technical definition.

Definition 3.2. Let m be a finite ordinal > 0. An s word is a finite string of substitutions (s^j_i) $(i, j < m)$, a c word is a finite string of cylindrifications $(\mathsf{c}_i), i < m$; an sc word w, is a finite string of both, namely, of substitutions and cylindrifications. An sc word induces a partial map $\hat{w} : m \to m$:

- $\hat{\epsilon} = Id$,
- $\widehat{w^i_j} = \hat{w} \circ [i|j]$,
- $\widehat{w\mathsf{c}_i} = \hat{w} \restriction (m \smallsetminus \{i\})$.

If $\bar{a} \in {}^{<m-1}m$, we write $\mathsf{s}_{\bar{a}}$, or $\mathsf{s}_{a_0 \dots a_{k-1}}$, where $k = |\bar{a}|$, for an arbitrary chosen sc word w such that $\hat{w} = \bar{a}$. Such a w exists by [19, Definition 5.23 Lemma 13.29].

We also need the notion of m–dimensional hyperbasis. This hyperbasis is made up of m–dimensional hypernetworks. An m–dimensional hypernetwork on the atomic algebra $\mathfrak{A}$ is an n–dimensional network N, with $\mathsf{nodes}(N) \subseteq m$, endowed with a set of labels Λ for hyperedges of length $\leq m$, not equal to n (the dimension), such that $\Lambda \cap \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A} = \emptyset$. We call a label in Λ a non–atomic label.

Like in networks, n–hyperedges are labelled by atoms. In addition to the consistency properties for networks, an m–dimensional hypernetwork should satisfy the following additional consistency rule involving non–atomic labels: If $\bar{x}, \bar{y} \in {}^{\leq m}m$, $|\bar{x}| = |\bar{y}| \neq n$ and $\exists \bar{z}$, such that $\forall i < |\bar{x}|$, $N(x_i, y_i, \bar{z}) \leq \mathsf{d}_{01}$, then $N(\bar{x}) = N(\bar{y}) \in \Lambda$. (We shall deal with hypernetworks in item (1) of theorem 5.1).

Definition 3.3. Let $2 < n < m < \omega$ and $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{CA}_n$ be atomic.

(1) An m–dimensional basis B for $\mathfrak{A}$ consists of a set of n–dimensional networks whose nodes $\subseteq m$, satisfying the following properties:

- For all $a \in \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$, there is an $N \in B$ such that $N(0, 1, \ldots, n-1) = a$,
- The *cylindrifier property*: For all $N \in B$, all $i < n$, all $\bar{x} \in {}^n\mathsf{nodes}(N)(\subseteq {}^n m)$, all $a \in \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$, such that $N(\bar{x}) \leq \mathsf{c}_i a$, there exists $M \in B$, $M \equiv_i N$, $\bar{y} \in {}^n\mathsf{nodes}(M)$ such that $\bar{y} \equiv_i \bar{x}$ and $M(\bar{y}) = a$. We can always assume that $\bar{y}_i$ is a new node else one takes $M = N$.

(2) An m–dimensional hyperbasis H consists of m–dimensional hypernetworks, satisfying the above two conditions reformulated the obvious way for hypernetworks, in addition, H has an amalgamation property for overlapping hypernertworks off at most 2 nodes; this property corresponds to commutativity of cylindrifiers:

For all $M, N \in H$ and $x, y < m$, with $M \equiv_{xy} N$, there is $L \in H$ such that $M \equiv_x L \equiv_y N$. Here $M \equiv_S N$, means that M and N agree off of S [19, Definition 12.11].

The next example taken from [10] alerts us to the fact that the diagonal free algebras we study, namely, Scs and PAs may not be necessarily completely additive. We cannot assume *a priori* that they are. So in the next lemma, and other lemmas whose proofs depend on complete addtivity of the s_i^js, we will have to assume explicity complete additivity in the hypothesis which is superfluous for any K between CA and PEA.

Example 3.4. We give the outline. Let $|U| = \mu$ be an infinite set and $|I| = \kappa$ be a cardinal such that Q_n, $n \in \kappa$, is a family of relations that form a partition of $U \times U$. Let $i \in I$, and let $J = I \sim \{i\}$. Then of course $|I| = |J|$. Assume that $Q_i = D_{01} = \{s \in V : s_0 = s_1\}$, and that each Q_n is symmetric; that is for any $S_{[0,1]}Q_n = Q_n$ and furthermore, that $\mathsf{dom}Q_n = \mathsf{rng}Q_n = U$ for every $n \in \kappa$. It is straightforward to show that such partitions exist. Now fix F a non–principal ultrafilter on J, that is $F \subseteq \mathcal{P}(J)$. For each $X \subseteq J$, define

$$R_X = \begin{cases} \bigcup\{Q_k : k \in X\} & \text{if } X \notin F, \\ \bigcup\{Q_k : k \in X \cup \{i\}\} & \text{if } X \in F \end{cases}$$

Let

$$\mathfrak{A} = \{R_X : X \subseteq J\}.$$

Notice that $|\mathfrak{A}| \geq \kappa$. Also $\mathfrak{A}$ is an atomic set algebra with unit R_J, and its atoms are $R_{\{k\}} = Q_k$ for $k \in J$. (Since F is non-principal, so $\{k\} \notin F$ for every k). This can be proved exactly like in [10]. We check substitutions. Transpositions are clear (recall that Q_k's are symmetric), so we check only replacements. It is easy to see that

$$\mathsf{s}_0^1(R_X) = \begin{cases} \emptyset & \text{if } X \notin F, \\ R_J & \text{if } X \in F \end{cases}$$

Now we show that s_0^1 is not completely additive:

$$\sum\{\mathsf{s}_0^1(R_k) : k \in J\} = \emptyset.$$

and

$$\mathsf{s}_0^1(R_J) = R_J$$

$$\sum\{R_{\{k\}} : k \in J\} = R_J = \bigcup\{Q_k : k \in J\}.$$

Thus

$$\mathsf{s}_0^1(\sum\{R_{\{k\}} : k \in J\}) \neq \sum\{\mathsf{s}_0^1(R_{\{k\}}) : k \in J\}.$$

Accordingly for a class K of BAOs, we write K^{ad} for the class of completely additive algebras in K. We have just seen that for $\mathsf{K} \in \{\mathsf{Sc}, \mathsf{PA}\}$, $\mathsf{K}_2^{\mathsf{ad}} \neq \mathsf{K}_2$. In [10] more examples can be found establishing that $\mathsf{K}_n^{\mathsf{ad}} \neq \mathsf{K}_n$ for all $n > 1$ replacing, in the infinite dimensional case, polyadic algebras by quasi-polyadic algebras.

One can define m–smooth representations as in [19, Definition 13.12]. But like infinitary m–flat representations, they really do not add much to m–flatness as far as (ordinary as opposed to complete) representations are concerned. But they do in the case of *complete* m–relativized representations, witness item (3) in the coming lemma. An algebra having a complete m–flat representation, has an m–infinitary flat representation, but not necessarily a complete one.

Lemma 3.5. *[19, Theorems 13.45, 13.36]. Assume that $2 < n < m < \omega$ and that K is any class between Sc and PEA. Let $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{K}_n$. Then the following hold:*

(1) $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_m \iff \mathfrak{A}$ has an m–smooth representation $\iff \mathfrak{A}$ has has an infinitary m–flat representation $\iff \mathfrak{A}$ has an m–flat representation $\iff \mathfrak{A}^+$ has an m–dimensional hyperbasis.

(2) If $\mathfrak{A}$ is atomic, then $\mathfrak{A}$ has a complete infinitary m–flat representation $\iff \mathfrak{A}$ has a complete m–smooth representation. $\iff \mathfrak{A} \in \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n(\mathsf{K}_m^{\mathsf{ad}} \cap \mathsf{At}) \iff \mathfrak{A}$ has an m–dimensional hyperbasis.

(3) If $\mathfrak{A}$ is atomic and has a complete m–flat representation, then $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_m$, but the dilation in K_m may not be atomic.

(4) If $\mathfrak{A}$ has an m–square representation, then $\mathfrak{A}^+$ has a complete m–square representation; a completely analogous result holds for m–flatness, infinitary m–flatness, and m–smoothness.

Proof. Fix $2 < n < m < \omega$. For the first item: As above, let $\mathfrak{L}(A)^m$ denote the signature that contains an n–ary predicate symbol for every $a \in A$. We prove the easier direction which is a soundness theorem: The existence of m–flat representations, implies the existence of m–dilations. Let M be an m–flat representation of $\mathfrak{A}$. We show that $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D}$, for some $\mathfrak{D} \in \mathsf{CA}_m$, and that $\mathfrak{A}$ actually has an infinitary m–flat representation.

For $\phi \in \mathfrak{L}(A)^m$, let $\phi^M = \{\bar{a} \in \mathsf{C}^m(M) : M \models_c \phi(\bar{a})\}$, where $\mathsf{C}^m(M)$ is the n–Gaifman hypergraph. Let $\mathfrak{D}$ be the algebra with universe $\{\phi^M : \phi \in \mathfrak{L}(A)^m\}$ and with cylindric operations induced by the n-clique–guarded (flat) semantics. For $r \in \mathfrak{A}$, and $\bar{x} \in \mathsf{C}^m(M)$, we identify r with the formula it defines in $\mathfrak{L}(A)^m$, and we write $r(\bar{x})^M \iff M, \bar{x} \models_c r$.

Then certainly $\mathfrak{D}$ is a subalgebra of the Crs_m (the class of algebras whose units are arbitrary sets of m–ary sequences) with domain $\wp(\mathsf{C}^m(M))$, so $\mathfrak{D} \in \mathsf{Crs}_\mathsf{m}$ with unit $1^{\mathfrak{D}} = \mathsf{C}^m(M)$. Since M is m–flat, then cylindrifiers in $\mathfrak{D}$ commute, and so $\mathfrak{D} \in \mathsf{CA}_m$.

Now define $\theta : \mathfrak{A} \to \mathfrak{D}$, via $r \mapsto r(\bar{x})^M$. Then exactly like in the proof of [19, Theorem 13.20], θ is a neat embedding, that is, $\theta(\mathfrak{A}) \subseteq \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D}$. It is straightforward to check that θ is a homomorphism. We show that θ is injective. Let $r \in A$ be non–zero. Then M is a relativized representation, so there is $\bar{a} \in M$ with $r(\bar{a})$, hence $\bar{a}$ is a clique in M, and so $M \models r(\bar{x})(\bar{a})$, and $\bar{a} \in \theta(r)$, proving the required.

M itself might not be infinitary m–flat, but one can build an infinitary m–flat representation of $\mathfrak{A}$, whose base is an ω–saturated model of the consistent first order theory, stipulating the existence of an m–flat representation [19, Proposition 13.17, Theorem 13.46 items (6) and (7)]. This idea (of using saturation) will be given in more detail in the last item.

The converse, essentially a completeness theorem, that is a 'truncated version' of Henkin's neat embedding theorem: *Existence of m–dimensional dilations* versus *existence of m–flat representations*. One constructs an infinitary m–flat representation M of $\mathfrak{A}$ from an *m–dimensional hyperbasis* [19, Definition 12.11] a notion that can be adapted to CAs, as illustrated next. But this m–dimensional hyperbasis is constructed for the *canonical extension* $\mathfrak{A}^+$.

The order of the proof is: Constructing an m–dilation, from which an m–dimensional hyperbasis is constructed, from which the required m– relativized representation is built.

We start by giving a fairly complete sketch of how an m–dimensional hyperbasis for the canonical extension of $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{CA}_n$ is obtained from an m–dilation of $\mathfrak{A}$ [19, Definition 13.22, lemmata 13.33-34-35, Proposition 36]. Suppose that $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D}$ for some $\mathfrak{D} \in \mathsf{CA}_m$. Then $\mathfrak{A}^+ \subseteq_c \mathfrak{Nr}_m\mathfrak{D}^+$, and $\mathfrak{D}^+$ is atomic. We show that $\mathfrak{D}^+$ has an m–dimensional hyperbasis. First, it is not hard to see that for every $n \leq l \leq m$, $\mathfrak{Nr}_l\mathfrak{D}^+$ is atomic. The set of non–atomic labels Λ is the set $\bigcup_{k<m-1} \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{Nr}_k\mathfrak{D}^+$.

For each atom a of $\mathfrak{D}^+$, define a labelled hypergraph N_a as follows. Let $\bar{b} \in {}^{\leq m}m$. Then if $|\bar{b}| = n$, so that $\bar{b}$ has to get a label that is an atom of $\mathfrak{D}^+$, one sets $N_a(\bar{b})$ to be the unique $r \in \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{D}^+$ such that $a \leq \mathsf{s}_{\bar{b}}r$; notation here is given in definition 3.2. If $n \neq |\bar{b}| < m-1$, $N_a(\bar{b})$ is the unique atom $r \in \mathfrak{Nr}_{|b|}\mathfrak{D}^+$ such that $a \leq \mathsf{s}_{\bar{b}}r$. Since $\mathfrak{Nr}_{|b|}\mathfrak{D}^+$ is atomic, this is well defined. Note that this label may be a non–atomic one; it might not be an atom of $\mathfrak{D}^+$. But by definition it is a permitted label. Now fix $\lambda \in \Lambda$. The rest of the labelling is defined by $N_a(\bar{b}) = \lambda$. Then N_a as an m–dimensional hypernetwork, for each such chosen a, and $\{N_a : a \in \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{D}^+\}$ is the required m–dimensional hyperbasis. The rest of the proof consists of a fairly straightforward adaptation of the proof [19, Proposition 13.37], replacing edges by n–hyperedges.

For the second item, we need: If $\mathfrak{A}$ is an atomic CA_n having an n–relativized representation M, then $f : \mathfrak{A} \to \wp(1^M)$ is a complete n–relativized representation of $\mathfrak{A}$, carrying meets to set–theoretic intersections $\iff$ f is atomic, in the sense that $\bigcup_{a \in \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}} f(a) = 1^M$. This is proved exactly like in the classical case [18].

Now one works in $L^m_{\infty,\omega}$ instead of first order logic. In this case, the dilation $\mathfrak{D}$ having again top element the Gaifman hypergraph $\mathsf{C}^m(M)$, where M the complete m–flat representation, will now have (the larger) universe $\{\phi^M : \phi \in \mathfrak{L}(A)^m_{\infty,\omega}\}$ with operations also induced by the n-clique–guarded semantics extended to $L^m_{\infty,\omega}$. $\mathfrak{D}$ will be a CA_m as before, but this time, it will be *an atomic* one. To prove atomicity, let ϕ^M be a non–zero element in $\mathfrak{D}$. Choose $\bar{a} \in \phi^M$, and consider the following infinitary conjunction (which we did not have before when working in L_m) [1]: $\tau = \bigwedge\{\psi \in \mathfrak{L}(A)^m_{\infty,\omega} : M \models_C \psi(\bar{a})\}$. Then $\tau \in \mathfrak{L}(A)^m_{\infty,\omega}$, and τ^M is an atom below ϕ^M. The neat embedding will be an atomic one, hence it will be a complete neat embedding [19, p. 411]. This last statement is proved in the third item. (In case of Scs and PAs the dilation will be completely additive because sums in uch a dilation defined like above are just unions.)

Conversely, if $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D}$, $\mathfrak{D}$ an atomic m–dilation, then the existence of an m–dimensional hyperbasis is exactly as done above, when constructing an m–dimensional hyperbasis from the atoms of the canonical extension of an m–dilation, giving a complete m–infinitary flat representation.

For third item, assume that $\mathfrak{A}$ has a complete m–flat representation M. Then one forms the dilation $\mathfrak{D} \in \mathsf{CA}_m$ like before, but like in the first item, working in $\mathfrak{L}(A)^m$, so that the dilation $\mathfrak{D}$ might not be atomic. However, the neat embedding map θ (using the above notation) is atomic, hence complete, because M is a complete m–flat representation. To see why, let $\phi \in \mathfrak{L}(A)^m$ such that $\phi^M \neq 0$. Pick $\bar{a} \in \phi^M$. Since M is a complete m–flat representation, and $\bar{a} \in \mathsf{C}^m(M)$, so

[1] There are set–theoretic subtleties involved here, that we prefer to ignore.

there exists an $\alpha \in \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$, such that $M \models_c \alpha(\bar{a})$, so $\bar{a} \in \alpha(\bar{x})^M = \theta(\alpha)$. Hence, $\theta(\alpha) \cdot \phi^M \neq 0$, and we are done.

Last item: This can be proved, using ideas of Hirsch and Hodkinson, by taking an ω–saturated model of the consistent theory stipulating the existence of an m–square representation for $\mathfrak{A}$, as the base of the complete m– square representation for $\mathfrak{A}^+$. In more detail, let M be an ω–saturated model, of this theory, then we show that it is a complete n–square representation. One defines an injective complete embedding $h : \mathfrak{A}^+ \to \wp(1^M)$. First note that the set $f_{\bar{x}} = \{a \in A : a(\bar{x})\}$ is an ultrafilter in $\mathfrak{A}$, whenever $\bar{x} \in M$ and $M \models 1(\bar{x})$. Now $\mathfrak{A}^+ = \mathfrak{C}m(\mathsf{Uf}\mathfrak{A})$. For $S \subseteq \mathsf{Uf}\mathfrak{A}$, let $h(S) = \{\bar{x} \in 1^M : f_{\bar{x}} \in S\}$.

We check only injectivity using saturation. For the (ideas used in) rest of the proof the reader is referred to [19, Corollary 13.18]. It suffices to show that for any ultrafilter F of $\mathfrak{A}$ which is an atom in $\mathfrak{A}^+$, we have $h(\{F\}) \neq 0$. Let $p(\bar{x}) = \{a(\bar{x}) : a \in F\}$. Then this type is finitely satisfiable. Hence by ω saturation p is realized in M by $\bar{y}$, say. Now $M \models 1(\bar{y})$ and $F \subseteq f_{\bar{x}}$, since these are both ultrafilters, equality holds. □

Now we devise games testing neat embeddability. The following lemma will be used quite often. It is a non–trivial adaptation of its relation algebra analogue, witness [16, Theorem 33], [19, Proposition 12.25, Theorem 13.45-46], to our present CA context.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $2 < n < m$. If $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{Sc}_m^{\mathsf{ad}}$, then $\exists$ has a winning strategy in F^m. In particular, if $\mathfrak{A}$ is a finite Sc_n, and $\forall$ has a winning strategy in F^m on $\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$, then $\mathfrak{A} \notin \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{Sc}_m$; if in addition $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{CA}_n$, then $\mathfrak{A}$ does not have an m–dimensional hyperbasis. If $\forall$ has a winning strategy in G^m_ω, then $\mathfrak{A}$ does not have a complete m–square representation. If $\mathfrak{A}$ is finite then it does not have an m–square representation and furthermore if $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{CA}_n$, then it does not have an m–dimensional basis.*

Proof. We start by proving the first part ending up with a winning strategy for $\exists$ in F^m. The proof uses ideas in [16, Lemma 29, 26, 27] formulated for relation algebras.

Proof of first part: Fix $2 < n < m$. Assume that $\mathfrak{C} \in \mathsf{Sc}_m$, $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{C}$ is an atomic Sc_n and N is an $\mathfrak{A}$–network with $\mathsf{nodes}(N) \subseteq m$. Define $\widehat{N} \in \mathfrak{C}$ by

$$\widehat{N} = \prod_{i_0,\dots,i_{n-1} \in \mathsf{nodes}(N)} \mathsf{s}_{i_0,\dots,i_{n-1}} N(i_0, \dots, i_{n-1}).$$

Here the substitution operator is defined as in definition 3.2. For a network N and function θ, the network $N\theta$ is the complete labelled graph with nodes $\theta^{-1}(\mathsf{nodes}(N)) = \{x \in \mathsf{dom}(\theta) : \theta(x) \in \mathsf{nodes}(N)\}$, and labelling defined by

$$(N\theta)(i_0, \dots, i_{n-1}) = N(\theta(i_0), \theta(i_1), \dots, \theta(i_{n-1})),$$

for $i_0, \dots, i_{n-1} \in \theta^{-1}(\mathsf{nodes}(N))$. Now suppose that the s^j_is for $i < j < m$ are completely additive in $\mathfrak{C}$. This condition is superfluous for any K between CA and PEA. Then the following hold:

1. for all $x \in \mathfrak{C} \setminus \{0\}$ and all $i_0, \dots, i_{n-1} < m$, there is $a \in \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$, such that $\mathsf{s}_{i_0,\dots,i_{n-1}} a \,.\, x \neq 0$,
2. for any $x \in \mathfrak{C} \setminus \{0\}$ and any finite set $I \subseteq m$, there is a network N such that $\mathsf{nodes}(N) = I$ and $x \,.\, \widehat{N} \neq 0$. Furthermore, for any networks M, N if $\widehat{M} \,.\, \widehat{N} \neq 0$, then $M\restriction_{\mathsf{nodes}(M)\cap\mathsf{nodes}(N)} = N\restriction_{\mathsf{nodes}(M)\cap\mathsf{nodes}(N)}$,

3. if θ is any partial, finite map $m \to m$ and if $\mathsf{nodes}(N)$ is a proper subset of m, then $\widehat{N} \neq 0 \to \widehat{N\theta} \neq 0$. If $i \notin \mathsf{nodes}(N)$, then $\mathsf{c}_i\widehat{N} = \widehat{N}$.

Since $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{C}$, then $\sum^{\mathfrak{C}} \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A} = 1$. For (1), we have, by assumption, s^i_j is a completely additive operator (any $i, j < m$), hence $\mathsf{s}_{i_0,\dots,i_{n-1}}$ is, too. So $\sum^{\mathfrak{C}}\{\mathsf{s}_{i_0\dots,i_{n-1}}a : a \in \mathsf{At}(\mathfrak{A})\} = \mathsf{s}_{i_0\dots i_{n-1}}\sum^{\mathfrak{C}} \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A} = \mathsf{s}_{i_0\dots,i_{n-1}}1 = 1$, for any $i_0, \dots, i_{n-1} < m$. Let $x \in \mathfrak{C} \setminus \{0\}$. Assume for contradiction that $\mathsf{s}_{i_0\dots,i_{n-1}}a \cdot x = 0$ for all $a \in \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$. Then $1 - x$ will be an upper bound for $\{\mathsf{s}_{i_0\dots i_{n-1}}a : a \in \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}\}$. But this is impossible because $\sum^{\mathfrak{C}}\{\mathsf{s}_{i_0\dots,i_{n-1}}a : a \in \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}\} = 1$.

To prove the first part of (2), we repeatedly use (1). We define the edge labelling of N one edge at a time. Initially, no hyperedges are labelled. Suppose $E \subseteq \mathsf{nodes}(N) \times \mathsf{nodes}(N) \dots \times \mathsf{nodes}(N)$ is the set of labelled hyperedges of N (initially $E = \emptyset$) and $x \,.\, \prod_{\bar{c}\in E} \mathsf{s}_{\bar{c}}N(\bar{c}) \neq 0$. Pick $\bar{d}$ such that $\bar{d} \notin E$. Then by (1) there is $a \in \mathsf{At}(\mathfrak{A})$ such that $x \,.\, \prod_{\bar{c}\in E} \mathsf{s}_{\bar{c}}N(\bar{c}) \,.\, \mathsf{s}_{\bar{d}}a \neq 0$. Include the hyperedge $\bar{d}$ in E. We keep on doing this until eventually all hyperedges will be labelled, so we obtain a completely labelled graph N with $\widehat{N} \neq 0$. it is easily checked that N is a network.

For the second part of (2), we proceed contrapositively. Assume that there is $\bar{c} \in \mathsf{nodes}(M) \cap \mathsf{nodes}(N)$ such that $M(\bar{c}) \neq N(\bar{c})$. Since edges are labelled by atoms, we have $M(\bar{c}) \cdot N(\bar{c}) = 0$, so $0 = \mathsf{s}_{\bar{c}}0 = \mathsf{s}_{\bar{c}}M(\bar{c}) \,.\, \mathsf{s}_{\bar{c}}N(\bar{c}) \geq \widehat{M} \,.\, \widehat{N}$. A piece of notation. For $i < m$, let Id_{-i} be the partial map $\{(k, k) : k \in m \smallsetminus \{i\}\}$. For the first part of (3) (cf. [19, lemma 13.29] using the notation in *op.cit*), since there is $k \in m \setminus \mathsf{nodes}(N)$, θ can be expressed as a product $\sigma_0\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_t$ of maps such that, for $s \leq t$, we have either $\sigma_s = Id_{-i}$ for some $i < m$ or $\sigma_s = [i/j]$ for some $i, j < m$ and where $i \notin \mathsf{nodes}(N\sigma_0 \dots \sigma_{s-1})$. But clearly $\widehat{NId_{-j}} \geq \widehat{N}$ and if $i \notin \mathsf{nodes}(N)$ and $j \in \mathsf{nodes}(N)$, then $\widehat{N} \neq 0 \to \widehat{N[i/j]} \neq 0$. The required now follows. The last part is straightforward.

Using the above proven facts, we are now ready to show that $\exists$ has a winning strategy in F^m. She can always play a network N with $\mathsf{nodes}(N) \subseteq m$, such that $\widehat{N} \neq 0$.

In the initial round, let $\forall$ play $a \in \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$. $\exists$ plays a network N with $N(0, \dots, n-1) = a$. Then $\widehat{N} = a \neq 0$. Recall that here $\forall$ is offered only one (cylindrifier) move. At a later stage, suppose $\forall$ plays the cylindrifier move, which we denote by $(N, \langle f_0, \dots, f_{n-2}\rangle, k, b, l)$. He picks a previously played network N, $f_i \in \mathsf{nodes}(N)$, $l < n, k \notin \{f_i : i < n-2\}$, such that $b \leq \mathsf{c}_l N(f_0, \dots, f_{i-1}, x, f_{i+1}, \dots, f_{n-2})$ and $\widehat{N} \neq 0$. Let $\bar{a} = \langle f_0 \dots f_{i-1}, k, f_{i+1}, \dots f_{n-2}\rangle$. Then by second part of (3) we have that $\mathsf{c}_l\widehat{N} \cdot \mathsf{s}_{\bar{a}}b \neq 0$ and so by first part of (2), there is a network M such that $\widehat{M} \cdot \widehat{\mathsf{c}_l N} \cdot \mathsf{s}_{\bar{a}}b \neq 0$. Hence $M(f_0, \dots, f_{i-1}, k, f_{i-2}, \dots, f_{n-2}) = b$, $\mathsf{nodes}(M) = \mathsf{nodes}(N) \cup \{k\}$, and $\widehat{M} \neq 0$, so this property is maintained. The second part, follows immediately by noting that $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{A}^+$, if $\mathfrak{A}$ is finite, and that if $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{Sc}_m \implies \mathfrak{A}^+ \in \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{Sc}_m$.

Proof of the rest: For the last required, we proceed contrapositively, and we deal only with CAs. Like the order of the difficult implication in the proof of the first item of lemma 3.6, dealing with completeness, the order of the proof is as follows: We first construct an m–dilation that might not be a CA_n; cylindrifiers may not commute. From the dilation we construct an m–dimensional basis. Then (instead of proving relativized representability) we prove the harder implication in the following equivalence (which is from left to right): An atomic $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{CA}_n$ has an m–dimensional basis $\iff$ $\exists$ has a winning strategy in $G^m(\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A})$.

Here we assume that m is finite (we will use the result in this restricted form only). So fix $2 < n < m < \omega$. Assume that $\mathfrak{A}$ is an atomic CA_n having a complete m–square representation.

We will show that $\exists$ has a winning strategy in G^m_ω.

As before, let M be a complete m–square representation of $\mathfrak{A}$. One constructs the m–dimensional dilation $\mathfrak{D}$ using $L^n_{\infty,\omega}$ formulas from a complete m–square representation exactly like in the proof of lemma 3.5. The neat embedding map $\theta : \mathfrak{A} \to \mathfrak{D}$ is the same, defined via $r \mapsto r(\bar{x})^M$. Here the m–neat reduct of $\mathfrak{D}$ is defined like the CA case, even though the dilation $\mathfrak{D}$ *may not be a* CA_m for we do not necessarily have commutativity of cylindrifiers, because there is no guarantee that M is m–flat. As before θ is an injective homomorphism into $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D}$, and $\mathfrak{D}$ is atomic.

For each $\bar{a} \in {}^{\mathfrak{D}}1$, define [19, Definition 13.22] a labelled hypergraph $N_{\bar{a}}$ with nodes m, and $N_{\bar{a}}(\bar{x})$ when $|\bar{x}| = n$, is the unique atom of $\mathfrak{A}$ containing the tuple of length $m > n$, $(a_{x_0}, \dots, a_{x_1}, \dots, a_{x_{n-1}}, a_{x_0} \dots, \dots a_{x_0})$. It is clear that if $s \in {}^{\mathfrak{D}}1$ and $i, j < m$, then $s \circ [i|j] \in {}^{\mathfrak{D}}1$.

Hence the above definition is sound. Indeed, if $\Psi : m \to m$ is defined by $\Psi(1) = x_1, \dots,$ $\Psi(n-2) = x_{n-2}$, and $\Psi(i) = x_0$ for $i \in m \sim \{1, \dots, n-2\}$, then Ψ is not injective, hence it is a composition of replacements, so $\bar{a} \circ \Psi = (a_{x_0}, \dots, a_{x_1}, \dots, a_{x_{n-1}}, a_{x_0} \dots \dots a_{x_0}) \in {}^{\mathfrak{D}}1$. It is also easy to see, since $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D}$, that if $\bar{a} = (a_0, \dots, a_{m-1}) \in {}^{\mathfrak{D}}1$, $i_0, \dots, i_{n-1} < m$ and $\bar{b} \in {}^{\mathfrak{D}}1$ is such that $\bar{b} \restriction n \subseteq \bar{a}$, then for all atoms $r \in \mathfrak{A}$, $\bar{b} \in r \iff r = N_{\bar{a}}(i_0, \dots, i_{n-1})$. Furthermore, [19, Lemma 13.24] $N_{\bar{a}}$ is a network.

Let H be the symmetric closure of $\{N_a : \bar{a} \in {}^M1\}$, that is $\{N\theta : \theta : m \to m, N \in H\}$. Then H is an m–dimensional basis [19, Lemma 13.26] as defined in the proof of lemma 3.6. Recall that H 'eliminates cylindrifiers' in the following sense: For all $a \in \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$, $i < n$ and $N \in H$, for all $\bar{x} \in {}^n\mathsf{nodes}(N)$, whenever $N(\bar{x}) \leq \mathsf{c}_i a$, then there is an $M \in H$, with $M \equiv_i N$, and $\bar{y} \in {}^n\mathsf{nodes}(M)$, such that $\bar{y} \equiv_i \bar{x}$ and $M(\bar{y}) = a$.

Now $\exists$ can win G^m_ω by always playing a subnetwork of a network in the constructed H. In round 0, when $\forall$ plays the atom $a \in \mathfrak{A}$, $\exists$ chooses $N \in H$ with $N(0, 1, \dots, n-1) = a$ and plays $N \restriction n$.

In round $t > 0$, inductively if the current network is $N_{t-1} \subseteq M \in H$, then no matter how $\forall$ defines N, we have $N \subseteq M$ and $|N| < m$, so there is $z < m$, with $z \notin \mathsf{nodes}(N)$. Assume that $\forall$ picks $x_0, \dots, x_{n-1} \in \mathsf{nodes}(N)$, $a \in \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$ and $i < n$ such that $N(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) \leq \mathsf{c}_i a$, so $M(x_0, \dots x_{n-1}) \leq \mathsf{c}_i a$, and hence (by the properties of H), there is $M' \in H$ with $M' \equiv_i M$ and $M'(x_0, \dots, z, \dots, x_{n-1}) = a$, with z in the ith place. Now $\exists$ responds with the restriction of M' to $\mathsf{nodes}(N) \cup \{z\}$.

The last part dealing with finiteness is obvious. Non–existence of an m–dimensional hyperbasis in the first case, and an m–dimensional basis in the second follows from the proof of lemma 3.5, by noting that if $\mathfrak{A}$ is finite, then $\mathfrak{A}^+ = \mathfrak{A}$. □

The following corollary is the CA analogue of [19, Theorem 13.45, item (1)–(4)]. Its proof can be easily discerned below the surface of the proofs of lemma 3.5, and second part of lemma 3.6.

Corollary 3.7. *Let $2 < n < m < \omega$. Let $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{CA}_n$. Then the following are equivalent:*

(1) $\mathfrak{A}^+$ has an m–dimensional basis.

(2) $\mathfrak{A}^+$ has a complete m–square representation.

(3) $\mathfrak{A}^+ \subseteq_c \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D}$, where $\mathfrak{D}$ is a set algebra having top element $V \subseteq {}^mU$, for some non-empty set U, such that if $s \in V$, and $i < j < m$, then $s \circ [i|j] \in V$. The operations in the m–dilation $\mathfrak{D}$ are like the operations in cylindric set algebras of dimension m, but relativized to the top element V. (For example: for $X \subseteq V$ and $i < m$, $\mathsf{c}_i X = \{t \in V : \exists s \in V : s \equiv_i t\}$).

(4) $\exists$ has a winning strategy in $G^m_\omega(\mathsf{Uf}\mathfrak{A})$.

If we consider PEA_m, we get that the dilation $\mathfrak{D}$ is in $\mathsf{G_m}$, and we require that the basis B is symmetric ($N \in B \implies N\theta \in B$). The analogous results for infinitary m–flatness, is replacing (symmetric) basis by (symmetric) hyperbasis, $\mathfrak{D}$ is a $\mathsf{CA}_m(\mathsf{PEA_m})$, and $\exists$ has a winning strategy in a 'hyperbasis game' which has an additional amalgamation move [19, Theorem 13.5, items (5)–(10)] corresponding to commutativity of cylindrifiers in the dilation.

Let $2 < n < m < \omega$. Let $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_m$, then $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{Fm}_T$ where T is a first order theory in the signature containing one n–ary *restricted* atomic formula for each $a \in A$ [15, Theorem 4.3.28 (1)] and equality. An n-ary restricted atomic formula is one of the form $R(x_0, \dots x_{n-1})$ where R is a relation symbol of arity n and the variables occur in their natural order, so we might as well write R for $R(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1})$. Here the quotient is defined via provability with respect to the proof system in [15, pp. 157] formulated for restricted formulas, *using m variables in the derivations*, and the rules of modus ponens and generalization. We say that T is m–consistent if $\mathfrak{Fm}_T \neq 0$.

Definition 3.8. Let $2 < n < m < \omega$. Let $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{CA}_n$ be countable. Then the formula $\phi \in \mathfrak{L}(A)^m$, is *$\mathfrak{A}$-$m$–flat valid*, if for all m–flat representations M of $\mathfrak{A}$, for all $s \in \mathsf{C}^m(M)$, $M, s \models_c \phi$.

Now we can easily obtain the following completeness theorems, one for each $m \geq n$, using the simple proof system in [15]. We write $\vdash_k$ for provability using k variables.

Theorem 3.9. *Let everything be as above. Then for $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_m$, $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{Fm}_T$ say, the formula ϕ in $\mathfrak{L}(A)^n$ is $\mathfrak{A}$ m–flat valid $\iff$ $T \vdash_m \phi$.*

Proof. Soundness is by induction on the length of proof by noting that axioms are valid in n–clique guarded semantics and that both modus ponus and generalization (the rules of inference adopted in the aforemention proof system) 'preserves' n–clique guarded semantics; for example if ϕ and $\phi \to \psi$ are $\mathfrak{A}$ m–flat valid, then ψ is also $\mathfrak{A}$ m–flat valid.

Now we prove (completeness) $\implies$. The argument is the standard textbook argument. Let $\mathfrak{A}$ and T be such that $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{Fm}_T$, and assume that $\phi \in \mathfrak{L}(A)^m$ is $\mathfrak{A}$ m—valid. Assume for contradiction that it is not the case that $T \vdash_m \phi$. Then $T \cup \{\neg\phi\}$ is m–consistent, so it has an m–flat model M, hence M is an m–flat representation of $\mathfrak{A}$ for which there exists $s \in C^m(M)$ such that $M, s \models \neg\phi$. This contradicts that ϕ is $\mathfrak{A}$ m–flat valid.

In more detail, we have $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{Fm}_T \in \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_m$ and $a = (\neg\psi_T) \neq 0$ in $\mathfrak{A}$, hence using an m–dilation of $\mathfrak{A}$, like in the proof of lemma 3.5, one constructs an m–dimensional hyperbasis of $\mathfrak{A}^+$, then one constructs the required m–flat representation M of $\mathfrak{A}$ from this m–dimensional hyperbasis, via θ say, that is $\theta : \mathfrak{A} \to \wp(1^M)$ is a homomorphism, and $\theta(a) \neq 0$. □

4 Complete representations

We generalize the characterization in [28, Theorem 5.3.6] to the infinite dimensional case addressing complete representations using weak set algebras, via complete neat embeddings dealing with algebras that can possibly have uncountably many atoms, witness theorem 4.6. For finite dimensions, we characterize complete representability of algebras having countably many atoms, via the games G_ω and F^ω.

Then we recall a result from [29] that marks the boundaries of our result obtained in the first item of our main theorem 5.1.

Let α be an arbitary ordinal. A *weak space of dimension α* is a set V of the form $\{s \in {}^\alpha U : |\{i \in \alpha : s_i \neq p_i\}| < \omega\}$ where U is a non–empty set and $p \in {}^\alpha U$. We denote V by ${}^\alpha U^{(p)}$.

GwKs_α is the class of *generalized weak set algebras* as defined in [15, Definition 3.1.2, item (iv)] for CAs; adapted the obvious way to other Ks. We have $\mathsf{GwKs}_\alpha = \mathbf{SP}\mathsf{WKs}_\alpha$, where WKs_α denotes the class of weak set algebra of dimension α. The top elements of GwKs_αs are *generalized weak spaces* of dimension α; these are disjoint unions of weak spaces of the same dimension.

For $\alpha \geq \omega$, we let DKc_α denote the class of *dimension complemented* $\mathsf{K}_\alpha s$, so that $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{DKc}_\alpha \iff \alpha \sim \Delta x$ is infinite for every $x \in \mathfrak{A}$.

Definition 4.1. Let α be any ordinal. Then $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{K}_\alpha$ is *completely representable* if there exists $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathsf{GwKs}_\alpha$ and an isomorphism $f : \mathfrak{A} \to \mathfrak{B}$ (respecting the K concrete operations on $\wp(V)$) such for all $X \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$, $f(\prod X) = \bigcap f(X)$ whenever $\prod X$ exists.

For finite α the above definition is the usual one [18]. We use the fact that, like in relativized representations, complete representations are atomic ones [18]; the characterization in *opcit* lifts easily to the infinite dimensional case. In this context, as expected, if $\mathfrak{A}$ is an atomic K_α, then an isomorphism $f : \mathfrak{A} \to \wp(V)$, V a generalized weak space, is *atomic*, if $\bigcup_{a \in \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}} f(a) = V$. For a class $\mathbf{K}$ of BAOs, we write $\mathbf{K}^{\mathsf{atc}}$ for $(\mathbf{K} \cap \mathsf{At})^{\mathsf{ad}}$, that is, $\mathbf{K}^{\mathsf{atc}}$ is the class of atomic completely additive algebras in $\mathbf{K}$.

Theorem 4.2. *Let α be any countable ordinal (possibly infinite) and $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{K}_\alpha$. If $\mathfrak{A}$ is atomic and has countably many atoms, then $\mathfrak{A}$ is completely representable $\iff$ $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathsf{K}^{\mathsf{atc}}_{\alpha+\omega}$. The implication $\implies$ holds without any restriction on the cardinality of the atoms.*

Proof. Assume that $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathsf{K}^{\mathsf{ad}}_{\alpha+\omega}$ has countably many atoms. Then $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathfrak{D}$ for some $\mathfrak{D} \in \mathsf{K}_{\alpha+\omega}$, where $\mathfrak{D}$ is completely additive. We want to show that $\mathfrak{A}$ is completely representable. We can assume that $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{Tm}\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$, because $\mathfrak{Tm}\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$ is dense in $\mathfrak{A}$, hence $\mathfrak{Tm}\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathfrak{D}$, so that $\mathfrak{Tm}\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathfrak{D}$. Furthermore, a complete representation of $\mathfrak{Tm}\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$ induces a complete representation of $\mathfrak{A}$. In particular, we can assume that $\mathfrak{A}$ is countable. Let $\mathfrak{B} = \mathfrak{S}g^{\mathfrak{D}}\mathfrak{A}$. Then $\mathfrak{B}$ is countable, too, $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{B}$ and $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathsf{DKc}_{\alpha+\omega}$. This can be proved inductively, by noting that $\mathfrak{S}g^{\mathfrak{B}}\mathfrak{A}$ is generated by elements whose dimensions sets are included in α, and for $i, j < \alpha + \omega$ and $x \in \mathfrak{B}$, we have $\Delta\mathsf{c}_i x \subseteq \Delta x$, and if present in the signature: $\Delta\mathsf{d}_{ij} = \{i, j\}$, $\Delta\mathsf{s}^j_i x \subseteq \Delta x \cup \{i, j\}$ and $\Delta\mathsf{s}_{[i,j]} x \subseteq \Delta \cup \{i, j\}$, so that $|\alpha + \omega \sim \Delta x| \geq \omega$ for all $x \in \mathfrak{S}g^{\mathfrak{B}}\mathfrak{A}$.

We use [27, Theorem 3.2.4], replacing $\mathfrak{Fm}_T$ in *op.cit* by $\mathfrak{B}$, so we need to make sure that certain suprema exist when we do not have diagonal elements. We cannot assume *a priori* that they do, witness example 3.4. In fact, the available proofs we have seen depend on the existence of diagonal elements. We assume without loss that all substitution operations corresponding to replacements are in the signature.

Let $X = \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$. We claim that for any $i < j \in \alpha+\omega$, $\sum \mathsf{s}^{j\,\mathfrak{B}}_i X = 1$. If not, then there exists $b \in \mathfrak{B}$, $b < 1$, such that $\mathsf{s}^{j\,\mathfrak{B}}_i x \leq b$ for all $x \in X$. But then $b \in \mathfrak{D}$ is an upper bound of $\{\mathsf{s}^{j\,\mathfrak{D}}_i x : x \in X\}$ in $\mathfrak{D}$. But, by assumption, $\mathfrak{D}$ is completely additive, hence $1 = \mathsf{s}^{j\,\mathfrak{D}}_i(\sum X) = \sum_{x \in X} \mathsf{s}^{j\,\mathfrak{D}}_i x \leq b < 1$, which is impossible. Let Y be the set of co–atoms of $\mathfrak{A}$, then by the above we readily obtain $\prod \mathsf{s}^j_i(Y) = 0$ in $\mathfrak{B}$ for all $i < j \in \alpha + \omega$.

We also need to make sure that for all $k \in \beta = \alpha + \omega$, $\mathsf{c}_k x = \sum_{l \in \beta} \mathsf{s}^k_l x$ in $\mathfrak{B}$, a sum that is valid when we have diagonal elements [15, Theorem 1.11.6].

As it happens, the proof for CAs does not use diagonal elements; it lifts as is to Pinter's algebras. Fix $k < \beta$. Then for all $l \in \beta$, we have $\mathsf{s}^k_l x \leq \mathsf{c}_k x$. Conversely, assume that $y \in \mathfrak{B}$ is an upper bound for $\{\mathsf{s}^k_l x : l \in \beta\}$. Let $l \in \beta \sim (\Delta x \cup \Delta y)$; such an l exists, because $\mathfrak{B}$ is dimension complemented and $x, y \in \mathfrak{B}$. Hence, we get that $\mathsf{c}_l x = x$ and $\mathsf{c}_l y = y$. But then $\mathsf{c}_l \mathsf{s}^k_l x \leq y$, and so $\mathsf{c}_k x \leq y$. We have proved that the above suprema holds in all cases.

Now by complete additivity of the substitution operations s_τs, τ a finite transformation on β (s_τ is defined as a composition of finitely many completely additive substitution operations corresponding to replacements), one has all the machinery of the the proof of theorem [27, Theorem 3.2.4], so one can omit the one non–principal type of co–atoms, getting the required complete representation. In more detail, let S be the Stone space of $\mathfrak{B}$ and let $V = {}^{\beta}\beta^{(Id)}$. For $b \in \mathfrak{B}$, let N_b denote the basic clopen set $\{F \in \mathsf{Uf}\mathfrak{B} : b \in F\}$. Let $\mathbf{G} = \bigcup_{i\in\beta}\bigcup_{x\in\mathfrak{B}} \mathbf{G}_{j,x}$ and $\mathbf{H} = \bigcup_{\tau\in V} \mathbf{H}_\tau$, where $\mathbf{G}_{j,x} = N_{\mathsf{c}_j x} \sim \bigcup_{i\notin\Delta x} N_{\mathsf{s}^j_i x}$ and $\mathbf{H}_\tau = S \sim \bigcup_{x\in\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{B}} N_{\mathsf{s}_\tau x}$ are nowhere dense sets in the Stone topology. Then given $0 \neq a \in \mathfrak{B}$, one can find using an ultrafilter $F \in (S \sim \mathbf{H} \cup \mathbf{G}) \cap N_a$, since $\mathbf{H} \cup \mathbf{G}$ is meager (a countable union of nowhere dense sets), so by the Baire Category theorem for compact Hausdorff spaces, $S \sim (\mathbf{H} \cup \mathbf{G})$ is dense in the Stone topology. This ultrafilter can be used to build a complete representation $f : \mathfrak{B} \to \wp(W)$ such that $f(a) \neq 0$; f is defined, using the notation of [27, p.216], via $f(x) = \{\bar\tau \in W : \mathsf{s}^{\mathfrak{B}}_\tau x \in F\}$ $(x \in \mathfrak{B})$. Here $W = V/\sim$, where $\sim$ is the equivalence relation defined on V by $s \sim t \iff \mathsf{d}_{s(i)t(i)} \in F$ for all $i < \beta$.

Here the countability condition is essential, witness the last item of theorem 5.1.

Now we prove $\Longrightarrow$. Here we do not require that $\mathfrak{A}$ has countably many atoms. The proof is very similar to the proof of [16, Theorem 29], except that we deal with weak set algebras when dealing with infinite dimensions. Furthermore, we have to check that the dilations defined during the proof are not merely atomic, but also *completely additive*. Assume that M is the base of a complete representation of $\mathfrak{A}$, whose unit is a weak generalized space, that is, $1^M = \bigcup {}^nU_i^{(p_i)}$ $p_i \in {}^\alpha U_i$, where ${}^\alpha U_i^{(p_i)} \cap {}^\alpha U_j^{(p_j)} = \emptyset$ for distinct i and j, in some index set I, that is, we have an isomorphism $t : \mathfrak{B} \to \mathfrak{C}$, where $\mathfrak{C} \in \mathsf{GKs}_\alpha$ has unit 1^M, and t preserves arbitrary meets carrying them to set–theoretic intersections.

For $i \in I$, let $E_i = {}^\alpha U_i^{(p_i)}$. Take $f_i \in {}^{\alpha+\omega}U_i^{q_i}$ where $q_i \restriction \alpha = p_i$ and let $W_i = \{f \in {}^{\alpha+\omega}U_i^{(q_i)} : |\{k \in \alpha+\omega : f(k) \neq f_i(k)\}| < \omega\}$. Let $\mathfrak{C}_i = \wp(W_i)$. Then $\mathfrak{C}_i$ is atomic; indeed the atoms are the singletons. Since the sums in $\mathfrak{C}_i$ are just unions, then $\mathfrak{C}_i$ is completely additive.

Let $x \in \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathfrak{C}_i$, that is $\mathsf{c}_i x = x$ for all $\alpha \leq i < \alpha+\omega$. Now if $f \in x$ and $g \in W_i$ satisfy $g(k) = f(k)$ for all $k < \alpha$, then $g \in x$. Hence $\mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathfrak{C}_i$ is atomic; its atoms are $\{g \in W_i : \{g(i) : i < \alpha\} \subseteq U_i\}$.

Define $h_i : \mathfrak{A} \to \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathfrak{C}_i$ by $h_i(a) = \{f \in W_i : \exists a' \in \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}, a' \leq a; (f(i) : i < \alpha) \in t(a')\}$. Let $\mathfrak{D} = \mathbf{P}_i\mathfrak{C}_i$. Let $\pi_i : \mathfrak{D} \to \mathfrak{C}_i$ be the ith projection map. Now clearly $\mathfrak{D}$ is atomic, because it is a product of atomic algebras, and its atoms are $(\pi_i(\beta) : \beta \in \mathsf{At}(\mathfrak{C}_i))$. Furthermore, $\mathfrak{D}$ is completely additive, since its components are. Now $\mathfrak{A}$ embeds into $\mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathfrak{D}$ via $J : a \mapsto (\pi_i(a) : i \in I)$. If $x \in \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathfrak{D}$, then for each i, we have $\pi_i(x) \in \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathfrak{C}_i$, and if x is non–zero, then $\pi_i(x) \neq 0$. By atomicity of $\mathfrak{C}_i$, there is an α–ary tuple y, such that $\{g \in W_i : g(k) = y_k\} \subseteq \pi_i(x)$. It follows that there is an atom of $b \in \mathfrak{A}$, such that $x \cdot J(b) \neq 0$, and so the embedding is atomic, hence complete. We have shown that $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathsf{K}^{\mathsf{atc}}_{\alpha+\omega}$ and we are done. It readily follows that $\mathfrak{A}$ is atomic, because it is dense in the atomic dilation. □

Given any cardinal κ, possibly infinite, $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{K}_m$, with $m < \omega$, then (complete) κ–square representations of $\mathfrak{A}$ can be easily defined [19, Definition 17.22].

If $\omega \leq \kappa < \lambda$, an algebra having a complete λ–square representation, may not have a complete κ–square one. The rainbow algebra of dimension n, for any $2 < n < \omega$, $\mathfrak{A} = \mathsf{PEA}_{\lambda,\kappa}$ witnesses this. Any complete κ–square representation of $\mathfrak{A}$ will force a 'κ red clique' indexed by the λ greens which is impossible because the indices of reds must match within the red clique.

Theorem 4.3. *If $m < \omega$, and $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_m\mathsf{K}^{\mathsf{ad}}_\omega$ is atomic, then $\exists$ has a winning strategy in both F^ω and G_ω. Furthermore, $\mathfrak{A}$ has a complete ω–square representation, an ordinary representation,*

and a complete ω–square representation. If $\mathfrak{A}$ has countably many atoms, then it has a complete (ordinary) representation.

Proof. Let $m < \omega$ and $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_m\mathsf{K}^{\mathsf{ad}}_\omega$, so that $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{Nr}_m\mathfrak{D}$, $\mathfrak{D} \in \mathsf{K}_\omega$ and $\mathfrak{D}$ is completely additive. The winning strategy' s for F^ω and G_ω are like in lemma 3.6; $\exists$ plays networks N, such $\mathsf{nodes}(N) \subseteq \omega$, maintaining the property that $\widehat{N} \neq 0$, using the ω–dilation $\mathfrak{D}$ which is completely additive, so lemma 3.6 applies.

Now we focus on CAs. The other cases are completely analogous undergoing the obvious modifications. Let $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{CA}_m$ and assume that $\exists$ has a winning strategy in $G_\omega(\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A})$. Extending the notion of finite dimensional basis in the obvious way (witness too the proof of the first part of the item (4) of theorem 5.1), we will build an *ω–dimensional basis for $\mathfrak{A}$*, from which the ω–square complete representation of $\mathfrak{A}$ will be built. An ω–dimensional basis B for $\mathfrak{A}$, consists of a set of n–dimensional networks on $\mathfrak{A}$ satsifying the closure properties for a finite-dimensional basis, but here for $N \in B$, we have $\mathsf{nodes}(N) \subseteq_\omega \omega$.

For a network N and a map $\theta : \omega \to N$, let H be the set of all such $N\theta$ (as defined in the first item of lemma 3.6), where N occurs in some play of $G_\omega(\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A})$ which $\exists$ uses her winning strategy.

Then, it can be checked without too much difficulty that H is an ω–dimensional basis for $\mathfrak{A}$. Given a hypergrah M with m–hyperedge relation E, then $C \subseteq M$ is a clique if for all injective map $s : m \to C$, we have $s \in E$. Then a complete ω–square representation can be obtained in a step–by–step way, requiring inductively in step t, that for any finite clique C of M_t, where the hyperedge relation is 1^{M_t}, $|C| < \omega$, there is a network N in the base, and an embedding $\theta : N \to M_t$ (of hypergraphs) such that $\mathsf{rng}\theta \supseteq C$. Then M_t satisfies the first three items (by replacing M by M_t) and the limit hypergraph, which is the base required of the representation will be fixed (along the way) to satisfy [19, Proposition 13.37, Lemma 17.24]:

1. each m–hyperedge of of M is labelled by an atom of $\mathfrak{A}$,
2. $M(\bar{x}) \leq \mathsf{d}_{ij} \iff x_i = x_j$,
3. for any clique $\bar{x} \in M$ of arbitrary finite length $> m$, there is a unique $N \in H$, such that $\bar{x}$ is labelled by N, and we write this as $M(\bar{x}) = N$,
4. if $l \geq m$ is finite, $x_0, \ldots, x_{l-1} \in M$ and $M(\bar{x}) = N \in H$, then for all $i_0, \ldots, i_{m-1} < l$, we have $(x_{i_0} \ldots x_{i_{m-1}})$ is a hyperedge, and $M(x_{i_0}, x_{i_1}, \ldots, x_{i_{m-1}}) = N(i_0, \ldots, i_{m-1}) \in \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$,
5. M is *symmetric* (closed under substitutions; $N \in M \implies N\theta \in M$, any θ),
6. if $\bar{x}$ is a clique of arbitrary length, $k < |x|$ and $N \in H$, then $M(\bar{x}) \equiv_k N \iff$ there is a $y \in M$ such that $M(x_0, \ldots, x_{k-1}, y, x_{k+1}, \ldots, x_l, \ldots) = N$ (with y in the kth place),
7. for every $N \in H$, for every finite $l \geq m$, there are $x_0, \ldots, x_{l-1} \in M$, $M(\bar{x}) = N$.

Then M will be an ω–square complete representation of $\mathfrak{A}$, defined for $r \in \mathfrak{A}$ via

$$M \models r(\bar{x}) \iff \bar{x} \text{ is an } m\text{–hyperedge of } M \text{ and } M(\bar{x}) \leq r.$$

M is a complete representation, because every m–hyperedge is labelled by an atom, so that M is an atomic, hence complete representation.

Now fix $2 < m < \omega$. Then it is not hard to show that countable algebras having ω–square representations are representable. Also, it is not too hard to show that the class of K_ms having

ω–square representations is a discriminator variety, and that it coincides with $\mathsf{RK_m}$ on countable simple algebras, hence the two varieties are equal. So if $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{K}_m$ (regardless of its cardinality) has an ω–square representation, then it is representable, witness too, item (2) of theorem 6.5. This, as mentioned above, is not true for complete ω–square representations.

The last part follows immediately from [19, Theorem 3.3.3], by noting that the κ in *opcit* is, in our present situation, the least infinite cardinal ω; then one uses the fact that $\exists$ has a winning strategy in G_ω established above.

□

F^ω and G_ω are the same game, they test complete ω–square representations. When truncated to $m < \omega$ nodes, F^m tests complete m–flatness, while G^m_ω tests complete m–squareness, witness lemma 3.6. In this sense, G_ω is a limiting cases, when we deal with countable algebras.

We have proved the following corollary which is the K analogue of [16, Theorem 29] counting in infinite dimensions in the first part.

Corollary 4.4. *Let α be an arbitary countable ordinal. Then $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{K}_\alpha$ is completely representable $\implies$ $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathsf{K}^{\mathsf{atc}}_{\alpha+\omega}$ $\implies$ $\mathfrak{A}$ is atomic and $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathsf{K}^{\mathsf{ad}}_{\alpha+\omega}$. Furthermore, if $\alpha < \omega$, and $\mathfrak{A}$ is completely representable, then $\exists$ has a winning strategy in G_ω and F^ω. All reverse implications hold, if $\mathfrak{A}$ has countably many atoms.*

We will show, in item (4) of theorem 5.1, that the second implication in the second line cannot be reversed if $\mathfrak{A}$ has uncountably many atoms. But the first implication in the same line can be reversed, modulo an extra condition on the dilation, as shown in the first item of the next theorem 4.6, addressing only QEAs that can possibly have uncountably many atoms. We do not know whether this extra condition can be omitted. In the second item of the same theorem other conditions are imposed on dilations which are strict expansions of quasi polyadic algebras (with and without equality), enforcing complete representability for finite dimensional polyadic and polyadic equality algebras, that are complete subneat reducts of such dilations. But first a lemma:

Lemma 4.5. *(1) Let α be an ordinal and $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{K}_\alpha$. If $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathfrak{D}$, where $\mathfrak{D} \in \mathsf{DKc}_{\alpha+\omega}$, then $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{D}$.*

(2) [19, Lemma 2.16] Let α be any ordinal. If $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{D} \in \mathsf{K}_\alpha$ and $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{D}$ and $\mathfrak{D}$ is atomic, then $\mathfrak{A}$ is atomic.

(3) If $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{D} \in \mathsf{K}_\alpha$, $\mathfrak{A}$ is atomic, then $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{D}$ $\iff$ for all non–zero $d \in \mathfrak{D}$, there exists $a \in \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$ such that $a \cdot d \neq 0$ [19, Lemma 2.17]. If $\mathfrak{A}$ is dense in $\mathfrak{B}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$ is atomic then $|\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}| \geq |\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{B}|$.

(4) [16, Lemma 17] If $\mathfrak{D}$ is completely representable, then so is $\mathfrak{A}$.

Proof. (1) Assume that $S \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$ and $\sum^{\mathfrak{A}} S = 1$, and for contradiction, that there exists $d \in \mathfrak{D}$ such that $s \leq d < 1$ for all $s \in S$. Since $\mathfrak{D}$ is dimension complemented, then we can conclude that $J = \Delta d \sim \alpha$ is finite; we assume that it is not empty. So let $J = \{m_1, \dots, m_n\}$ ($m_i \in \alpha + \omega \sim \alpha$). Put $t = -\mathsf{c}_{m_1} \dots \mathsf{c}_{m_n}(-d)$. We claim that $t \in \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathfrak{D}$ and $s \leq t < 1$ for all $s \in S$. This contradicts $1 = \sum^{\mathfrak{A}} S$. The first required follows from the fact that all indices in $\alpha + \omega \sim \alpha$ that occur in d are cylindrified using easy manipulations of cylindric axioms. In more detail, let $\beta = \alpha + \omega$. Let $i \in \beta \sim \alpha$. If $i \notin \{m_1, \dots m_n\}$ then using that $\mathsf{c}_i(x \cdot \mathsf{c}_i z) = \mathsf{c}_i x \cdot \mathsf{c}_i z$, we have $\mathsf{c}_i t = t$.

Indeed, $y \in \mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha \mathfrak{B}$, so $\Delta y \subseteq \alpha$, hence $\mathsf{c}_i y = y$ and also $\mathsf{c}_i - \mathsf{c}_{m_1} = -\mathsf{c}_{m_1}$. Now assume that $i \in \{m_1, \dots, m_n\}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{c}_i t &= \mathsf{c}_i(-\mathsf{c}_{m_1} \dots \mathsf{c}_{m_n}(-d)) \\
&= \mathsf{c}_i - \mathsf{c}_{m_1} \dots \mathsf{c}_{m_n}(-d) \\
&= \mathsf{c}_i \cdot -\mathsf{c}_i \mathsf{c}_{m_1} \dots \mathsf{c}_{m_n}(-d) \\
&= -\mathsf{c}_i \mathsf{c}_{m_1} \dots \mathsf{c}_{m_n}(-d) \\
&= -\mathsf{c}_{m_1} \dots \mathsf{c}_{m_n}(-d) \\
&= t
\end{aligned}$$

In the first line we use $\mathsf{c}_i y = y$. From first to second line we use $\mathsf{c}_i(x \cdot z) = \mathsf{c}_i x \cdot z$. From second to third we use idempotency, namely, $\mathsf{c}_i \mathsf{c}_i x = \mathsf{c}_i x$ and finally, we use that cylindrifiers are complemented operators, namely, $\mathsf{c}_i(-\mathsf{c}_i x) = -\mathsf{c}_i x$. We have proved that $t \in \mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha \mathfrak{B}$ and we are done wth the first part of the required.

If $s \in S$, we show that $s \leq t$. By $s \leq d$, we have $s \cdot -d = 0$. Hence $0 = \mathsf{c}_{m_1} \dots \mathsf{c}_{m_n}(s \cdot -d) = s \cdot \mathsf{c}_{m_1} \dots \mathsf{c}_{m_n}(-d)$, so $s \leq -\mathsf{c}_{m_1} \dots \mathsf{c}_{m_n}(-d)$, hence $s \leq t$ as required. We finally check that $t < 1$. If not, then $1 = -\mathsf{c}_{m_1} \dots \mathsf{c}_{m_n}(-d)$ and so $\mathsf{c}_m \dots \mathsf{c}_{m_n}(-d) = 0$. But $-d \leq \mathsf{c}_m \dots \mathsf{c}_{m_n}(-d)$, so $1 \cdot -d \leq \mathsf{c}_m \dots \mathsf{c}_{m_n}(-d) = 0$. Hence $1 \cdot -d = 0$ and this contradicts that $d < 1$.

(2) Let $a \in A$ be non-zero. Then since $\mathfrak{D}$ is atomic, there exists an atom $d \in D$, such that $d \leq a$. Let $F = \{x \in A : x \geq d\}$. Then F is an ultrafilter of $\mathfrak{A}$. It is clear that F is a filter. Now assume that $c \in A$ and $c \notin F$, then $-c \cdot d \neq 0$, so $0 \neq -c \cdot d \leq d$, hence $-c \cdot d = d$, because d is an atom in $\mathfrak{B}$, thus $d \leq -c$, and we get by definition that $-c \in F$. We have shown that F is an ultrafilter. We now show that F is a principal ultrafilter in $\mathfrak{A}$, that is, it is generated by an atom. Assume for contradiction that it is not, so that $\prod^{\mathfrak{A}} F$ exists because F is an ultrafilter, and $\prod^{\mathfrak{A}} F = 0$ because it is non–principal. But $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{D}$, so we obtain $\prod^{\mathfrak{A}} F = \prod^{\mathfrak{D}} F = 0$. This contradicts that $0 < d \leq x$ for all $x \in F$. Thus $\prod^{\mathfrak{A}} F = a'$, a' is an atom in $\mathfrak{A}$, $a' \in F$ and $a' \leq a$, because $a \in F$.

(3) Assume that $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{D}$ and $\mathfrak{A}$ is atomic. Let $X = \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$. Then $\sum^{\mathfrak{A}} X = \sum^{\mathfrak{D}} X = 1$. If $b \neq 0$ in $\mathfrak{D}$, then $b \cdot \sum^{\mathfrak{D}} X = b$, hence there exists $a \in X$ such that $a \cdot b \neq 0$, for else $-b \neq 1$ will be an upper bound of X in $\mathfrak{D}$ which is imposible. Conversely, assume that $\sum^{\mathfrak{A}} S = 1$ and for contradiction that there exists $b' \in \mathfrak{D}$, $b' < 1$ such that $s \leq b'$ for all $s \in S$. Let $b = 1 - b'$ then $b \neq 0$, hence by assumption there exists an atom $a \in \mathfrak{A}$ such that $a \cdot b \neq 0$, i.e $a \cdot (1 - b') \neq 0$. If $a \leq s$ for some $s \in S$, then $a \leq b'$ which is impossible. So if $s \in S$, then $a \cdot s \neq a$, so $a \cdot s < a$ and because a is an atom, we get that $a \cdot s = 0$. This happens for every $s \in S$, implying that $a = 0$. But this is impossible, because a is an atom.

Now assume further that $\mathfrak{A}$ is dense in $\mathfrak{B}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$ is atomic. Then by density for every atom $b \in \mathfrak{B}$, there is a non–zero $a' \in \mathfrak{A}$, such that $a \leq b$ in $\mathfrak{B}$. Since $\mathfrak{A}$ is atomic, there is an atom $a \in \mathfrak{A}$ such that $a \leq a' \leq b$. But b is an atom of $\mathfrak{B}$, and a is non–zero in $\mathfrak{B}$, too, so it must be the case that $a = b \in \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$. Thus $\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{B} \subseteq \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$ and we are done.

(4) Let $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{D}$ and assume that $\mathfrak{D}$ is completely representable. We want to show that $\mathfrak{A}$ is completely representable. Let $f : \mathfrak{D} \to \wp(V)$ be a complete representation of $\mathfrak{D}$, that is, f is an embedding into the generalized weak set algebra with universe $\wp(V)$ preserving arbitrary suprema carrying them to set–theoretic unions. We claim that $g = f \restriction \mathfrak{A}$ is a complete representation of $\mathfrak{A}$. Let $X \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$ be such that $\sum^{\mathfrak{A}} X = 1$. Then by $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{D}$, we have $\sum^{\mathfrak{D}} X = 1$. Furthermore, for

all $x \in X(\subseteq \mathfrak{A})$ we have $f(x) = g(x)$, so that $\bigcup_{x\in X} g(x) = \bigcup_{x\in X} f(x) = V$, since f is a complete representation, and we are done. □

In the next proof, we use the two following elementary facts about Boolean algebras. We already used the one implication of the first in the proof of the first item of theorem 4.2.

- If $\mathfrak{B}$ is a Boolean algebra, with Stone space S, $X \subseteq \mathfrak{B}$, then $\sum^{\mathfrak{B}} X = 1 \iff S \sim \bigcup_{x\in X} N_x$ is nowhere dense in the Stone topology; here $N_x = \{F \in \mathsf{Uf}\mathfrak{A} : x \in F\}$ is a basic clopen set in S. We will use $\implies$.

- If $\mathfrak{B}$ is atomic, then the set of principal ultrafilters in $\mathsf{Uf}\mathfrak{B}$ is dense in the Stone topology.

If $\alpha \geq \omega$ and $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{K}_\alpha$ then it is always the case that $\mathsf{s}^k_l x \leq \mathsf{c}_k x$ for all $x \in A$ and $k, l < \alpha$. Sometimes c_k is the *least* upper bound of the set $\{\mathsf{s}^k_l x : l, k \in \alpha, l \neq k\}$. This happens in some significant cases like for example locally finite and dimension complemented algebras of dimension α. Furthermore, any algebra $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{K}_\alpha$ (not necessarily dimension complemented) for which $\mathsf{c}_k x = \sum \mathsf{s}^k_l x$ for all distinct $k, l \in \alpha$ and $x \in A$, is representable [15, Last item of Theorem 3.2.11]; this will be also proved in our next theorem under the additional assumption of atomicity.

If $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{K}_n$ has a (finite dimensional) dilation $\mathfrak{D}$ of dimension $m < \omega$, $(n < m)$, then using the argument in the first part of lemma 4.5, we get that $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D} \iff \mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{D}$, so, in particular, if $\mathfrak{A}$ is atomic with set of atoms X, and $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D}$, then $\sum^{\mathfrak{D}} X = 1$. Using the argument in the second part of lemma 4.5, we get that if $\mathfrak{D}$ is atomic, then so is $\mathfrak{A}$.

But if $\mathfrak{D}$ is *not dimension complemented* and $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathfrak{D}$, we do not know whether it follows that $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{D}$. Lemma 4.5 does not help here. We cannot see why it should be the case that $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{D}$, because if $d \in D$ then $\Delta d \sim n$ could be infinite and so the technique used in *op.cit* does not work here. (In principal, another argument might work giving the same result). The converse though can be easily shown to be true, that is if $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{D}$, then $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D}$, because if $X \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$, is such that $\sum^{\mathfrak{A}} X = 1$, then $1 = \sum^{\mathfrak{D}} X \leq \sum^{\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D}} X \leq \sum^{\mathfrak{A}} X = 1$.

Let α be an infinite ordinal. Let CPES_α be the class of *strong polyadic equality algebras of dimension* α as introduced by Ferenczi in [14, Definition 6.3.8]. These are like PEA_αs except that the signature and axiomatization are restricted only to finite cylindrifiers. Cylindrfication on infinite subsets of α is not allowed. But all substitution operations s_τ, $\tau \in {}^\alpha\alpha$ are present in the new signature. Let CPS_α be their diagonal free reducts defined by restricting the signature and axiomatization of PA_α to finite cylindrifiers. Again here all substitution operations are present.

Theorem 4.6. *Let α be any ordinal.*

(1) Let $\mathsf{K} \in \{\mathsf{PA}, \mathsf{PEA}\}$. If $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathfrak{D}$, $\mathfrak{D} \in \mathsf{K}_{\alpha+\omega} \cap \mathsf{At}$, $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{D}$ and for all $x \in \mathfrak{D}$ for all $k < \alpha + \omega$, $\mathsf{c}_k x = \sum_{l\in\alpha+\omega} \mathsf{s}^k_l x$, then $\mathfrak{A}$ is completely representable.

(2) If $\alpha < \omega$ and $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathfrak{D}$, $\mathfrak{D} \in \mathsf{PA}^{\mathsf{atc}}_\omega$, $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{D}$, then $\mathfrak{A}$ is a completely representable PA_α. The same result holds for PEAs under the weaker assumption that the dilation $\mathfrak{D}$ is only atomic. We can replace PA_ω and PEA_ω by CPS_ω and CPES_ω, respectively.

Proof. We prove the first item: By $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{D}$, we get by lemma 4.5 that $\mathfrak{A}$ is atomic because $\mathfrak{D}$ is. For $\alpha \leq 1$, any atomic algebra in $\mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathsf{K}_\omega = \mathsf{RK}_\alpha$ is completely representable; in particular, any algebra in $\mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha(\mathsf{K}_\omega \cap \mathsf{At})$ is completely representable, so we assume that $\alpha > 1$. Let $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{K}_\alpha$ and $\mathfrak{D} \in \mathsf{K}_{\alpha+\omega} \cap \mathsf{At}$ be as in the hypothesis.

Before embarking on the technical details, we first give the general idea inspired by the idea used in [12]. Here we cannot appeal to the Baire category theorem as we did in the first part of

the proof of theorem 4.2 using [27, Theorem 3.2.4], because $\mathfrak{A}$ may have uncountably many atoms. Nevertheless, our proof is still topological using the elementary fact that in atomic Boolean algebras principal ultrafilters lie outside nowhere dense subsets of the Stone space. The topological approach is not necessary, but it makes the proof shorter.

We represent $\mathfrak{D}$ using a principal ultrafilter in $\mathfrak{D}$. Because $\mathfrak{D}$ is atomic, such principal ultrafilters are dense in the Stone space S of $\mathfrak{D}$; we have 'many' of them. So we can pick one that preserves a given set of infinite joins, namely those given in the hypothesis (these have to do with eliminating cylindrifiers) and other joins that reflect omitting substituted versions of the co-atoms carrying them to empty set-theoretic intersections in the concrete representation of $\mathfrak{D}$. In $\mathfrak{D}$ these joins, give rise to nowhere dense sets in S, so that any principal ultrafilter of $\mathfrak{D}$ containing the non-zero element c will be outside these sets, and will give the required representation of $\mathfrak{D}$. At least one such ultrafilter exists because there is an atom below c.

Now we implement the details of the above outline. Let $c \in \mathfrak{A}$ be non–zero, and for brevity we denote $\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$ by X. We will show that there exists a $\mathfrak{C} \in \mathsf{WKs}_\alpha$ and a homomorphism $f : \mathfrak{A} \to \mathfrak{C}$, such that $f(c) \neq 0$ and $\bigcup_{x \in X} f(x) = 1^{\mathfrak{C}}$, by which we will be done.

For brevity, let $\beta = \alpha + \omega$. Let V be the weak space ${}^{\beta}\beta^{(Id)} = \{\tau \in {}^{\beta}\beta : |\{i \in \beta : \tau(i) \neq i\}| < \omega\}$. Then every $\tau \in V$ defines a unary substitution operation $\mathsf{s}^{\mathfrak{D}}_\tau$, that is a Boolean endomorphism of the Boolean reduct of $\mathfrak{D}$. Every s_τ is a finite composition of substitution operations corresponding to replacements and transpositions; so they are completely additive, since a composition of completely additive operations is completely additive, hence every such s_τ is a complete Boolean endomorphism of the Boolean reduct of $\mathfrak{D}$.

We have $\sum^{\mathfrak{D}} X = 1$, because $\mathfrak{A}$ is atomic, so that $\sum^{\mathfrak{A}} X = 1$ and $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{D}$. Furthermore, in $\mathfrak{D}$ the following joins exist for all $i < \beta$, $x \in D$ and $\tau \in V$ the first by hypothesis and the second by complete additivity of τ:

- $\mathsf{c}_i x = \sum^{\mathfrak{D}}_{j \in \beta} \mathsf{s}^i_j x$,
- $\sum \mathsf{s}^{\mathfrak{D}}_\tau X = 1$.

Now let S be the Stone space of $\mathfrak{D}$, whose underlying set is $\mathsf{Uf}\mathfrak{D}$. The set of principal Boolean ultrafilters of $\mathfrak{D}$ (those generated by the atoms) are isolated points in the Stone topology, and they form a dense set since $\mathfrak{D}$ is atomic.

For $a \in \mathfrak{D}$, let N_a denote the clopen set (in S) of all Boolean ultrafilters containing a. From the suprema existing in above two items, we get that for all $i \in \beta$, $x \in D$ and $\tau \in V$, the sets

- $G_{i,x} = N_{\mathsf{c}_i x} \sim \bigcup_{j \in \omega} N_{\mathsf{s}^i_j x}$,
- $G_{X,\tau} = S \sim \bigcup_{x \in X} N_{\mathsf{s}_\tau x}$.

are nowhere dense in S. Let F be a principal ultrafilter in S containing c. This ultrafilter exists, since $\mathfrak{D}$ is atomic, so there is an atom a below c; just take the ultrafilter generated by a. Now $N_a = \{F\}$, the latter is a basic open set, so F lies outside nowhere dense sets in S, that is for any such nowhere dense set $T \subseteq S$, say, we have $N_a \cap T = \emptyset$. In particular, $F \notin G_{i,x}$ and $F \notin G_{X,\tau}$ for all $i \in \beta, x \in \mathfrak{B}$ and $\tau \in V$.

Assume that $\mathsf{K} = \mathsf{QEA}$. Then we factor out β by $E \subseteq \beta \times \beta$ defined as follows: $(i, j) \in E \iff \mathsf{d}^{\mathfrak{D}}_{ij} \in F$. Then it is easy to check, using elementary properties of diagonal elements, and filters that E is an equivalence relation on β. For $t : m \to \beta/\sim$, $m \leq \beta$, write $t = \bar{s}$, if $s : m \to \beta$ is such that $t(i) = s(i)/E$ for all $i < m$.

Now define for $a \in A$, $f(a) = \{\bar{\tau} \in {}^n(\beta/E)^{(\bar{Id})} : \mathsf{s}^{\mathfrak{B}}_{\tau \cup Id} d \in F\}$. We claim that the map $f : \mathfrak{A} \to \wp({}^n(\beta/E)^{\bar{Id}})$ is well defined. It suffices to show that for all $\sigma, \tau \in V$, if $(\tau(i), \sigma(i)) \in E$ for all $i \in \beta$ and $a \in A$, then $\mathsf{s}_\tau a \in F \iff \mathsf{s}_\sigma a \in F$. This can be proved by induction on $|\{i \in \beta : \tau(i) \neq \sigma(i)\}| (< \omega)$. If $J = \{i \in \beta : \tau(i) \neq \sigma(i)\}$ is empty, the result is obvious. Otherwise assume that $k \in J$. We introduce a helpful piece of notation. For $\eta \in V (= {}^\beta\beta^{(Id)})$, let $\eta(k \mapsto l)$ stand for the η' that is the same as η except that $\eta'(k) = l$. Now take any $\lambda \in \{\eta \in \beta : (\sigma)^{-1}\{\eta\} = (\tau)^{-1}\{\eta\} = \{\eta\}\} \setminus \Delta a$. Recall that $\Delta a = \{i \in \beta : \mathsf{c}_i x \neq x\}$ and that $\beta \setminus \Delta a$ is infinite because $\Delta a \subseteq n$, so such a λ exists. Now we freely use properties of substitutions for cylindric algebras. We have by [15, 1.11.11(i)(iv)] (a) $\mathsf{s}_\sigma x = \mathsf{s}^\lambda_{\sigma k} \mathsf{s}_{\sigma(k \mapsto \lambda)} x$, and (b) $\mathsf{s}^\lambda_{\tau k}(\mathsf{d}_{\lambda, \sigma k} \cdot \mathsf{s}_\sigma x) = \mathsf{d}_{\tau k, \sigma k} \mathsf{s}_\sigma x$, and (c) $\mathsf{s}^\lambda_{\tau k}(\mathsf{d}_{\lambda, \sigma k} \cdot \mathsf{s}_{\sigma(k \mapsto \lambda)} x) = \mathsf{d}_{\tau k, \sigma k} \cdot \mathsf{s}_{\sigma(k \mapsto \tau k)} x$, and finally (d) $\mathsf{d}_{\lambda, \sigma k} \cdot \mathsf{s}^\lambda_{\sigma k} \mathsf{s}_{\sigma(k \mapsto \lambda)} x = \mathsf{d}_{\lambda, \sigma k} \cdot \mathsf{s}_{\sigma(k \mapsto \lambda)} x$. Then by (b), (a), (d) and (c), we get,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{d}_{\tau k, \sigma k} \cdot \mathsf{s}_\sigma x &= \mathsf{s}^\lambda_{\tau k}(\mathsf{d}_{\lambda, \sigma k} \cdot \mathsf{s}_\sigma x) \\
&= \mathsf{s}^\lambda_{\tau k}(\mathsf{d}_{\lambda, \sigma k} \cdot \mathsf{s}^\lambda_{\sigma k} \mathsf{s}_{\sigma(k \mapsto \lambda)} x) \\
&= \mathsf{s}^\lambda_{\tau k}(\mathsf{d}_{\lambda, \sigma k} \cdot \mathsf{s}_{\sigma(k \mapsto \lambda)} x) \\
&= \mathsf{d}_{\tau k, \sigma k} \cdot \mathsf{s}_{\sigma(k \mapsto \tau k)} x.
\end{aligned}$$

By F is a filter and $\tau k E \sigma k$, we conclude that

$$\mathsf{s}_\sigma x \in F \iff \mathsf{s}_{\sigma(k \mapsto \tau k)} x \in F.$$

The conclusion follows from the induction hypothesis.

We have proved that f is well defined. We now check that f is a homomorphism, i.e. it preserves the operations. It is straightforward to check that f preserves diagonal elements. The relation E is defined exactly for that. Preservation of the Boolean operations is equally straightforward using the properties of F. Preservation of cylindrifiers follows from how F was picked. The ultrafilter F 'eliminates cylindrifiers' in the sense that: for all $i < \beta$ (in particular, for $i < n$), for all $a \in \mathfrak{D}$ (in particular, for $a \in \mathfrak{A}$), if $\mathsf{c}_i a \in F$, then there exists $j \notin \Delta a$, such that $\mathsf{s}^{j\mathfrak{D}}_i a \in F$. We provide more details. For $\sigma \in {}^n\beta^{(Id)}$, write σ^+ for $\sigma \cup Id_{\beta \sim n} \in {}^\beta\beta^{(Id)}$.

- Boolean operations: Since F is maximal we have $\bar{\sigma} \in f(x + y) \iff \mathsf{s}_{\sigma^+}(x + y) \in F \iff \mathsf{s}_{\sigma^+} x + \mathsf{s}_{\sigma^+} y \in F \iff \mathsf{s}_{\sigma^+} x$ or $\mathsf{s}_{\sigma^+} y \in F \iff \bar{\sigma} \in f(x) \cup f(y)$.

  We now check complementation.

  $$\bar{\sigma} \in f(-x) \iff \mathsf{s}_{\sigma^+}(-x) \in F \iff -\mathsf{s}_{\sigma^+ x} \in F \iff \mathsf{s}_{\sigma^+} x \notin F \iff \bar{\sigma} \notin f(x).$$

- Diagonal elements: Let $k, l < n$. Then we have: $\sigma \in f\mathsf{d}_{kl} \iff \mathsf{s}_{\sigma^+}\mathsf{d}_{kl} \in F \iff \mathsf{d}_{\sigma k, \sigma l} \in F \iff \sigma k E \sigma l \iff \sigma k/E = \sigma l/E \iff \bar{\sigma}(k) = \bar{\sigma}(l) \iff \bar{\sigma} \in \mathsf{d}_{kl}$.

- Cylindrifications: Let $k < n$ and $a \in A$. Let $\bar{\sigma} \in \mathsf{c}_k f(a)$. Then for some $\lambda \in \beta$, we have $\bar{\sigma}(k \mapsto \lambda/E) \in f(a)$ hence $\mathsf{s}_{\sigma^+(k \mapsto \lambda)} a \in F$ It follows from the inclusion $a \leq \mathsf{c}_k a$ that , $\mathsf{s}_{\sigma^+(k \mapsto \lambda)} \mathsf{c}_k a \in F$ so $\mathsf{s}_{\sigma^+} \mathsf{c}_k a \in F$. Thus $\mathsf{c}_k f(a) \subseteq f(\mathsf{c}_k a.)$

  We prove the other more difficult inclusion that uses the condition of eliminating cylindrifiers. Let $a \in A$ and $k < n$. Let $\bar{\sigma}' \in f\mathsf{c}_k a$ and let $\sigma = \sigma' \cup Id_{\beta \sim n}$. Then $\mathsf{s}^{\mathfrak{D}}_\sigma \mathsf{c}_k a = \mathsf{s}^{\mathfrak{D}}_{\sigma'} \mathsf{c}_k a \in F$. Let $\lambda \in \{\eta \in \beta : \sigma^{-1}\{\eta\} = \{\eta\}\} \setminus \Delta a$, such a λ exists because Δa is finite, and $|\{i \in \beta : \sigma(i) \neq i\}| < \omega$. Let $\tau = \sigma \restriction \beta \setminus \{k, \lambda\} \cup \{(k, \lambda), (\lambda, k)\}$. Then in $\mathfrak{D}$, we have $\mathsf{c}_\lambda \mathsf{s}_\tau a = \mathsf{s}_\tau \mathsf{c}_k a = \mathsf{s}_\sigma \mathsf{c}_k a \in F$. By the construction of F, there is some $u (\notin \Delta(\mathsf{s}^{\mathfrak{D}}_\tau a))$ such that $\mathsf{s}^\lambda_u \mathsf{s}_\tau a \in F$, so $\mathsf{s}_{\sigma(k \mapsto u)} a \in F$. Hence $\sigma(k \mapsto u) \in f(a)$, from which we get that $\bar{\sigma}' \in \mathsf{c}_k f(a)$.

- Substitutions: Direct since substitution operations are Boolean endomorphisms

We also have $f(c) \neq 0$, because clearly $\bar{Id} \in f(c)$. Now it remains to show that the hitherto defined non–zero homomorphism f is an atomic, hence, a complete representation.

We have $F \notin G_{X,\tau}$ for every $\tau \in V$, hence for every $\bar{s} \in {}^{\alpha}(\beta/E)^{(\bar{Id})}$, there exists $x \in X (= \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A})$, such that $\mathsf{s}^{\mathfrak{B}}_{\bar{s} \cup Id_{\beta \sim \alpha}} x \in F$, from which we get the required, namely, that $\bigcup_{x \in X} f(x) = {}^{\alpha}(\beta/E)^{(\bar{Id})}$.

If $\mathsf{K} = \mathsf{QA}$ then we let E be the identity relation and proceed as above.

Now for the second item: We denote the finite ordinal α by n $(< \omega)$. Assume that $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{A}'$, $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq \mathfrak{Nr}_n \mathfrak{A}'$, $\mathfrak{A}' \in \mathsf{PA}_\omega$ is atomic and completely additive. Then by [12] $\mathfrak{A}'$ is completely representable. Hence there exists an isomorphism $f : \mathfrak{A}' \to \wp(V)$, where V is a generalized space, f preserves the polyadic operations, such that $\bigcup_{x \in \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}'} f(x) = V$. Let $V = \bigcup_{i \in I} {}^{\omega}U_i$ where I is a non-empty indexing set, and for $i \neq j \in I$, $U_i \cap U_j = \emptyset$. Let $V' = \bigcup_{i \in I} {}^{n}U_i$. For $a \in \mathfrak{A}$, define $g(a) = \{s \in V' : (\exists s' \in f(a))(s' \restriction n = s)\}$. It is straightforward to check that g is a non–zero homomorphism. Preservation of the polyadic operations is straightforward. To show that g is non-zero, let $a \in \mathfrak{A}$ be non-zero. Let $s \in f(a)$. Then $s \restriction n \in g(a)$; we have shown that g is actually an embedding.

Now f is a complete representation, hence it is an atomic one, so if $s \in {}^{n}U$, then there exists $\alpha \in \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}'$ such that $s \cup Id \in f(\alpha)$. We will show that g is also an atomic, hence a complete representation of $\mathfrak{A}$. Assume, for contradiction, that there exists $s \in {}^{n}U$, such that $s \notin g(\alpha)$ for each $\alpha \in \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$. But f is an atomic representation of $\mathfrak{A}'$, hence $s \cup Id \in f(\beta)$ for some atom β of $\mathfrak{A}'$. Let $G = \{b \in \mathfrak{A} : b \geq \beta\}$. Then clearly $\prod^{\mathfrak{A}} G = 0$ and $\prod^{\mathfrak{A}'} G \geq \beta$, which contradicts that $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{A}'$. So $\bigcup_{a \in \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}} g(a) = {}^{n}U$ and we have proved that g is an atomic, hence a complete representation of $\mathfrak{A}$.

Now we deal with PEAs. The ordinal n remains to be finite. Assume $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{PEA}_n$, $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq \mathfrak{Nr}_n \mathfrak{A}'$, $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{A}'$ and $\mathfrak{A}' \in \mathsf{PEA}_\omega \cap \mathsf{At}$. Since $\mathfrak{A}' \in \mathsf{PEA}_\omega$, then it is completely additive. We know from the above argument that $\mathfrak{Rd}_{pa} \mathfrak{A}'$ is completely representable, and that the restriction of this complete representation, as defined above, to $\mathfrak{Rd}_{pa} \mathfrak{A}$ gives a complete representation of $\mathfrak{Rd}_{pa} \mathfrak{A}$.

To represent the diagonal elements in $\mathfrak{A}$, we need to know for a start *how the diagonal free reduct of the completely additive atomic dilation $\mathfrak{A}'$ is completely represented.* Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be this reduct, so that in particular $\mathfrak{C} \in \mathsf{PA}_\omega$, and let $c \in \mathfrak{C}$ be non-zero. We will find (identifying set algebras with their domains), a complete PA_ω representation $f : \mathfrak{C} \to \wp({}^{\omega}U)$, for some non-empty set U, such that $f(c) \neq 0$.

We use the argument in [12] which freely uses the terminology in [20]. Let $\mathfrak{m}$ be the local degree of $\mathfrak{C}$, $\mathfrak{c}$ its effective cardinality and $\mathfrak{n}$ be any cardinal such that $\mathfrak{n} \geq \mathfrak{c}$ and $\sum_{s < \mathfrak{m}} \mathfrak{n}^s = \mathfrak{n}$. Then there exists an atomic $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathsf{PA}_\mathfrak{n}$ such that that $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{Nr}_\omega \mathfrak{B}$, cf. [20, theorem 3.10], and the local degree of $\mathfrak{B}$ is the same as that of $\mathfrak{C}$. Furthermore, because $\mathfrak{A}' \in \mathsf{PEA}_\omega$, we have $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathsf{PEA}_\mathfrak{n}$. One can define for all $i < j < \mathfrak{n}$, the diagonal element $\mathsf{d}^{\mathfrak{B}}_{ij}$ as in [15, Theorem 5.4.17]; but for a while we concentrate only on the polyadic reduct of $\mathfrak{B}$, which we denote also by $\mathfrak{B}$; that is we forget about diagonal elements that will be used at the last part of the proof.

Let $\Gamma \subseteq \alpha$ and $p \in \mathfrak{C}$. Then in $\mathfrak{B}$ we have, see [20, proof of theorem 6.1]: $\mathsf{c}_{(\Gamma)} p = \sum \{\mathsf{s}_{\bar{\tau}} p : \tau \in {}^{\alpha}\mathfrak{n}, \ \ \tau \restriction \alpha \sim \Gamma = Id\}$. Here for a transformation τ with domain ω and range included in $\mathfrak{n}$, $\bar{\tau} = \tau \cup Id_{\mathfrak{n} \sim \omega}$. Let X be the set of atoms of $\mathfrak{C}$. Since $\mathfrak{C}$ is atomic, then $\sum^{\mathfrak{C}} X = 1$. By $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha \mathfrak{B}$, we also have $\sum^{\mathfrak{B}} X = 1$. By complete additivity we have for all $\tau \in {}^{\omega}\mathfrak{n}$, $\mathsf{s}^{\mathfrak{B}}_{\bar{\tau}} X = 1$.

Now working in the Stone space S of $\mathfrak{B}$, using the notation as in the first item of the proof, we have by the suprema evaluated above for all $\Gamma \subseteq \alpha$, $p \in A$ and $\tau \in {}^{\alpha}\mathfrak{n}$: $G_{\Gamma,p} = N_{\mathsf{c}_{(\Gamma)} p} \sim \bigcup_{\tau \in {}^{\alpha_\mathfrak{n}}} N_{s_{\bar{\tau}} p}$, and $G_{X,\tau} = S \sim \bigcup_{x \in X} N_{s_{\bar{\tau}} x}$ are nowhere dense. Let F be a principal ultrafilter of S containing c; exists because $\mathfrak{C}$ is atomic. Then as before, $F \notin G_{\Gamma,p}$, $F \notin G_{X,\tau}$, for every $\Gamma \subseteq \alpha$, $p \in$ and $\tau \in {}^{\alpha}\mathfrak{n}$.

Now define for $a \in \mathfrak{C}$ $f(a) = \{\tau \in {}^{\omega}\mathfrak{n} : \mathsf{s}^{\mathfrak{B}}_{\tau} a \in F\}$. Then f is the required complete representation of $\mathfrak{C}$.

Now we want to completely represent $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{A}' = \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{B}$. Recall that $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{PEA}_n$, so we need to preserve diagonal elements as well. As in the first item of the proof (putting the diagonal elements of $\mathfrak{B}$ to use), for $i, j \in \mathfrak{n}$, set $iEj \iff \mathsf{d}^{\mathfrak{B}}_{ij} \in F$.

Then, exactly as before, E is an equivalence relation on $\mathfrak{n}$ and for $s, t \in {}^{n}\mathfrak{n}$, if $(s(i), t(i)) \in E$ for each $i < n$, and $a \in \mathfrak{A}$, then $\mathsf{s}^{\mathfrak{A}'}_{s \cup Id} a \in F \iff \mathsf{s}^{\mathfrak{A}'}_{t \cup Id} a \in F$.

For $a \in \mathfrak{A}$, define $g(a) = \{\bar{t} \in {}^{n}(\mathfrak{n}/E) : \mathsf{s}^{\mathfrak{B}}_{\bar{t} \cup Id} a \in F\}$, where $\bar{t}(i/E) = t(i)$, then again it can be proved exactly like in the first item of the proof, that g is well–defined, and in fact g is the required complete representation of $\mathfrak{A}$ as a PEA_n.

Now we assume that $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D}$, $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{D}$, where $\mathfrak{D} \in \mathsf{CPS}_{\omega}$ is atomic and completely additive. The idea in the proof for PAs, was dilating $\mathfrak{D}$ to $\mathfrak{B}$ possessing 'enough spare dimensions' such that $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D} = \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{B}'$ and then completely representing $\mathfrak{D}$ by picking a principal ultrafilter in the Stone space of $\mathfrak{B}$ outside a nowhere dense set determined by two sets of joins; the first involving eliminating cylindrifiers via substitutions, and the second consists of permuted version of the atoms. The complete representation of $\mathfrak{A}$ was the restriction of the thereby obtained complete reprentation of $\mathfrak{D}$ to $\mathfrak{A}$ using the second item of lemma 4.5 since $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{D}$.

We show that this can be done with CPSs, too. By a *transformation system* we mean a quadruple of the form $(\mathfrak{A}, I, G, \mathsf{S})$ where $\mathfrak{A}$ is an algebra of any signature, I is a non-empty set, G is a subsemigroup of $({}^{I}I, \circ)$ (the operation $\circ$ denotes composition of maps) and S is a homomorphism from G to the semigroup of endomorphisms of $\mathfrak{A}$. Elements of G are called transformations.

Substitutions in $\mathfrak{D}$ induce a homomorphism of semigroups $S : {}^{\alpha}\alpha \to \mathsf{End}(\mathfrak{D})$ via $\tau \mapsto \mathsf{s}_{\tau}$, where $\mathsf{End}(\mathfrak{D})$ is the semigroup of Boolean endomorphisms on $\mathfrak{D}$. The operation on both semigroups is composition of maps; the latter is the semigroup of endomorphisms on $\mathfrak{D}$. For any set X, let $F({}^{\omega}X, \mathfrak{D})$ be the set of all maps from ${}^{\omega}X$ to $\mathfrak{D}$ endowed with Boolean operations defined pointwise and for $\tau \in {}^{\omega}\omega$ and $f \in F({}^{\omega}X, \mathfrak{D})$, put $\mathsf{s}_{\tau} f(x) = f(x \circ \tau)$. This turns $F({}^{\omega}X, \mathfrak{D})$ to a transformation system.

The map $H : \mathfrak{D} \to F({}^{\omega}\omega, \mathfrak{D})$ defined by $H(p)(x) = \mathsf{s}_x p$ is easily checked to be an embedding. Assume that $\beta \supseteq \omega$. Then $K : F({}^{\omega}\omega, \mathfrak{D}) \to F({}^{\beta}\omega, \mathfrak{D})$ defined by $K(f)x = f(x \restriction \omega)$ is an embedding, too. These facts are not too hard to establish [20, Theorems 3.1, 3.2]. Call $F({}^{\beta}\omega, \mathfrak{D})$ a minimal functional dilation of $F({}^{\omega}\omega, \mathfrak{D})$. Elements of the big algebra, or the (cylindrifier free) functional dilation, are of form $\mathsf{s}_{\sigma} p$, $p \in F({}^{\beta}\omega, \mathfrak{A})$ where σ restricted to ω is an injection [20, Theorem 4.3-4.4].

Let $\mathfrak{B}$ be the algebra obtained from $\mathfrak{D}$, by discarding its cylindrifiers, then taking a minimal functional dilation, dilating $\mathfrak{A}$ to a regular cardinal $\mathfrak{n}$[2], such that $|\mathfrak{n}| > \omega$ and $|\mathfrak{n} \sim \omega| = \mathfrak{n}$. Then one re-defines cylindrifiers in the dilation $\mathfrak{B}$ by setting for each $i \in \mathfrak{n}$:

$$\mathsf{c}_i \mathsf{s}^{\mathfrak{B}}_{\sigma} p = \mathsf{s}^{\mathfrak{B}}_{\rho^{-1}} \mathsf{c}^{\mathfrak{D}}_{(\rho(i) \cap \sigma(\omega))} \mathsf{s}^{\mathfrak{D}}_{(\rho\sigma \restriction \omega)} p.$$

Here ρ is a any permutation such that $\rho \circ \sigma(\omega) \subseteq \sigma(\omega)$. The definition is sound, that is, it is independent of ρ, σ, p; furthermore, it agrees with the old cylindrifiers in $\mathfrak{D}$. Identifying algebras with their transformation systems we have $\mathfrak{D} \cong \mathfrak{Nr}_{\omega}\mathfrak{B}$, via H defined for $f \in \mathfrak{D}$ and $x \in {}^{\mathfrak{n}}\omega$ by, $H(f)x = f(y)$ where $y \in {}^{\omega}\omega$ and $x \restriction \omega = y$, [20, Theorem 3.10]. This dilation also has Boolean reduct isomorphic to $F({}^{\mathfrak{n}}\omega, \mathfrak{D})$, in particular, it is atomic because $\mathfrak{A}$ is atomic (a product of atomic Boolean algebras is atomic). Then we have for all $j < \mathfrak{n}$, $p \in \mathfrak{B}$: $\mathsf{c}_j p = \sum_{i < \mathfrak{n}} \mathsf{s}^{j}_{i} p$ and, by complete

[2]If κ is a cardinal, then *the cofinality of* κ, in symbols $\mathsf{cf}\kappa$, is the least cardinal λ such that κ is the union of λ sets each having cardinality $< \kappa$. The cardinal κ is *regular* if $\mathsf{cf}\kappa = \kappa$.

additivity, for all $\tau \in {}^{\mathfrak{n}}\mathfrak{n}$: $\mathsf{s}^{\mathfrak{B}}_{\tau}\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A} = \mathsf{s}^{\mathfrak{B}}_{\tau}\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{D} = 1$. Now assume that $d \in \mathfrak{A}$, is such that $d \neq 0$. Form the nowhere dense sets corresponding to the above joins and then pick a principal ultrafilter containing d; one that is generated by an atom below d. The complete represenation of $\mathfrak{A}$ is now defined like before. In case of $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D}$, $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{D}$ and $\mathfrak{D} \in \mathsf{CPES}_\omega$, one dilates the CPS reduct of $\mathfrak{D}$, call it $\mathfrak{Rd}\mathfrak{D}$, to $\mathfrak{n}$ dimensions as above, obtaining $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathsf{CPS}_{\mathfrak{n}}$, such that $\mathfrak{Rd}\mathfrak{D} = \mathfrak{Nr}_\omega\mathfrak{B}$, then $\mathfrak{B}$ admits an expansion $\mathfrak{B}^+$ by diagonal elements, such that $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathsf{CPES}_{\mathfrak{n}}$, $\mathfrak{D} = \mathfrak{Nr}_\omega\mathfrak{B}^+$, and $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D} = \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{B}^+$. The rest is exactly like the PEA case. One picks a principal ultrafilter F in $\mathfrak{B}^+$ containing the given non-zero element of $\mathfrak{A}$, then one defines, for $i, j \in \mathfrak{n}$, $(i, j) \in E \iff \mathsf{d}_{ij} \in F$, and finally one sets (with notation $\bar{\tau}$ as above) $f(x) = \{\bar{\tau} \in {}^{n}(\mathfrak{n}/E) : \mathsf{s}^{\mathfrak{B}}_{\tau\cup Id} \in F\}$ $(x \in A)$. □

Now the following easy example shows us that the condition imposed in the hypothesis of the first item of the previous theorem 4.6 is not necessary.

Example 4.7. Let $\mathbf{0}$ the constant zero sequence with domain ω. Let $\mathfrak{D} \in \mathsf{QEA}_\omega$ be the full weak set algebra with top element ${}^{\omega}\omega^{(\mathbf{0})}$. Then, it is easy to show that for any $n < \omega$, $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{A}$ is completely representable. Let $X = \{\mathbf{0}\} \in \mathfrak{D}$. Then for all $i \in \omega$, we have $\mathsf{s}^0_i X = X$. But $(1, 0, \ldots) \in \mathsf{c}_0 X$, so that $\sum_{i\in\omega} \mathsf{s}^0_i X = X \neq \mathsf{c}_0 X$. Hence the condition stipulated in the first item of theorem 4.6 does not hold.

Now fix $1 < n < \omega$. If we take $\mathfrak{D}' = \mathfrak{S}g^{\mathfrak{D}}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D}$, then $\mathfrak{D}'$ of course will still be a weak set algebra, and it will be localy finite, so that $\mathsf{c}_i x = \sum^{\mathfrak{D}} \mathsf{s}^i_j x$ for all $i < j < \omega$ by the reasoning used in the first item of theorem 4.2. However, $\mathfrak{D}'$ will be atomless as we proceed to show. Assume for contradiction that it is not, and let $x \in \mathfrak{D}'$ be an atom. Choose $k, l \in \omega$ with $k \neq l$ and $\mathsf{c}_k x = x$, this is possible since $\omega \sim \Delta x$ is infinite. Then $\mathsf{c}_k(x \cdot \mathsf{d}_{kl}) = x$, so $x \cdot \mathsf{d}_{kl} \neq 0$. But x is an atom, so $x \leq \mathsf{d}_{kl}$. This gives that $\Delta x = 0$, and by [15, Theorem 1.3.19] $x \leq -\mathsf{c}_k - \mathsf{d}_{kl}$. It is also easy to see that $(\mathsf{c}_k - \mathsf{d}_{kl})^{\mathfrak{D}'} = {}^{\omega}\omega^{(\mathbf{0})}$, from which we conclude that $x = 0$, which is a contradiction.

We know from theorem 4.2 that if $n < \omega$ and $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega$ is atomic with countably many atoms, then $\mathfrak{A}$ is completely representable. This may not hold if $\mathfrak{A}$ has uncountably many atoms as shown in the last item of theorem 5.1, though this might be true if the ω–dilation is atomic. And indeed for PAs and PEAs the countability condition can be omitted when the dilations have all substitution operations and are atomic and completely additive (a condition that is superfluous for PEAs). The next theorem gives a huge class of completely representable PA_n and PEA_ns $(n < \omega)$ possibly having uncountably many atoms.

Corollary 4.8. *(1) If $\mathfrak{D} \in \mathsf{PA}_\omega$ is atomic and completely additive and $n < \omega$, then any $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathsf{PA}_n$, such that $\mathfrak{B} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D}$ is a completely representable PA_n. Hence, for any $n < \omega$, we have (using the notation introduced before theorem 4.2), $\mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{PA}^{\mathsf{atc}}_\omega \subseteq \mathsf{CRPA}_{\mathfrak{n}}$. Furthermore, If $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{S}g^{\mathfrak{D}}\mathfrak{B}$, then $\mathfrak{C}$ is locally finite, $\mathfrak{B} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{C} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{C}$. If $-\mathsf{c}_0 - \mathsf{d}_{01} \neq 0$ in $\mathfrak{B}$, then $\mathfrak{C} \not\subseteq_c \mathfrak{D}$.*

(2) The same result holds for PEAs without the condition of complete additivity, so that for any $n < \omega$, $\mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n(\mathsf{PEA}_\omega \cap \mathsf{At}) \subseteq \mathsf{CRPEA}_{\mathfrak{n}}$.

Proof. It suffices to show, by theorem 4.6, that $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{D}$ because then it will follow that $\mathfrak{B} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{D}$. Let $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D}$. Assume that $S \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$ and $\sum^{\mathfrak{A}} S = 1$, and for contradiction, that there exists $d \in \mathfrak{D}$ such that $s \leq d < 1$ for all $s \in S$. Let $J = \Delta d \sim n$. Put $t = -\mathsf{c}_{(J)}(-d)$. Then exactly as in the proof of the first item of lemma 4.5, we have $t \in \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D}$. We now show that $s \leq t < 1$ for all $s \in S$, which contradicts $1 = \sum^{\mathfrak{A}} S$. The proof is also completely analogous to the proof of the corresponding part in the first item of lemma 4.5, but using the possibly infinite cylindrifier $\mathsf{c}_{(J)}$; that is $J = \Delta d \sim n$ can be infinite. But all the same we give the details. If $s \in S$, we show that

$s \leq t$. By $s \leq d$, we have $s \cdot -d = 0$. Hence $0 = \mathsf{c}_{(J)}(s \cdot -d) = s \cdot \mathsf{c}_{(J)}(-d)$, so $s \leq -\mathsf{c}_{(J)}(-d)$, hence $s \leq t$ as required. Assume for contradiction that $t = 1$, then $1 = -\mathsf{c}_{(J)}(-d)$ and so $\mathsf{c}_{(J)}(-d) = 0$. But $-d \leq \mathsf{c}_{(J)}(-d)$, so $1 \cdot -d \leq \mathsf{c}_{(J)}(-d) = 0$. Hence $1 \cdot -d = 0$ and this contradicts that $d < 1$.

If $\mathfrak{C}$ is as in the last part, then $\mathfrak{C}$ is locally finite, because it is generated by n–dimensional elements, namely, the elements of $\mathfrak{B}$ (witness the first part of theorem 4.2). If $\sum^{\mathfrak{B}} S = 1$, then since $\mathfrak{B} \subseteq \mathfrak{C} \subseteq \mathfrak{D}$, we have $1 = \sum^{\mathfrak{D}} S \leq \sum^{\mathfrak{C}} S \leq \sum^{\mathfrak{B}} S = 1$, and by the first item of lemma 6.2, $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{C} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{C}$.

Using exactly the argument in example 4.7, we get that $\mathfrak{C}$, being locally finite, is atomless, so obviously it is not atomic. But $\mathfrak{D}$ is atomic, so by the second item of lemma 6.2, it cannot be the case that $\mathfrak{C} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{D}$ for this will force $\mathfrak{C}$ to be atomic.

For the second item, we also have $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{D}$ hence applying theorem 4.6, we get the required. □

Remark 4.9. We do not know whether the converse inclusion $\mathsf{CRA}_n \subseteq \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{PA}_\omega^{\mathsf{atc}}$ holds, but it seems to be highly unlikely. The following observation might be useful here. If $\mathfrak{D} \in \mathsf{PA}_\omega^{\mathsf{atc}}$ is infinite, then $\mathfrak{D}$ would have to be uncountable. To see why, first the set of atoms is of course infinite, too. Now for distinct permulations τ, σ on ω, and x an atom, $\mathsf{s}_\sigma x \neq \mathsf{s}_\tau x$, for else $x = \mathsf{s}_{\sigma^{-1}\circ\tau}x$; the right hand side is an atom, so it has to be x which means that $\sigma^{-1} \circ \tau = Id$, hence $\sigma = \tau$. Thus for each $x \in \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{D}$, $J = \{\mathsf{s}_\tau x : \tau \in S_\infty\} \subseteq \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{D}$, and so $|\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{D}| \geq |J| = |S_\infty| = \omega!$ (Here S_∞ is the symmetric group on ω). However, from the proof of theorem 4.2, we get that if $\mathfrak{B}$ is completely representable, then it has an uncountable ω–dilation $\mathfrak{C}$ that is a generalized weak set algebra such that $\mathfrak{B} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{C}$. Now $\mathfrak{C}$, sure enough, atomic and completely additive, is *only closed under substitutions corresponding to finite transformations*. It might not allow a polyadic structure (closure under infinitary substitutions). One could perhaps replace this ω–dilation by a *generalized set algebra* $\mathfrak{C}'$ which of course allows a polyadic structure, but in this case one could well lose the condition $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{C}'$.
Let us summarize some of what have said in the following theorem which actually gives what we want if we can replace '$\mathfrak{A}$ dense in $\mathfrak{B}$' by the weaker $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{B}$.

Theorem 4.10. *If $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{PA}_n$ is atomic, countable and completely representable, then there can be no $\mathfrak{D} \in \mathsf{PA}_\omega^{\mathsf{atc}}$, such that $\mathfrak{A}$ is dense in $\mathfrak{D}$. The same holds for PEA_n. (But it might be the case that $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{D}$.)*

Proof. Assume for contradiction that there is such a $\mathfrak{D}$. From the brief discussion in the above remark, we have $|\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{D}| > \omega$. Using third item in lemma 6.2 we get $|\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}| \geq |\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{D}|$, which is a contradiction because $\mathfrak{A}$ is countable, and and we are done. □

Question: Do we have an analogous theorem for CPS_ω and CPES_ω? The argument used above does not work to show that if $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{CPS}_\omega$, then $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{D}$, because there may exist an upper bound $d < 1$ in $\mathfrak{D}$ of $S \subseteq \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D}$ such that $\sum^{\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D}} S = 1$ and $J = \Delta d \sim n$ is infinite. In the present context of CPS_ωs, the infinite cylindrifier $\mathsf{c}_{(J)}$ is not defined to pull the element d back to the neat reduct $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D}$.

We identify set algebras with their domain. Let α be an ordinal. Assume that $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{K}_\alpha$ is completely representable. Then, by definition, $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \wp(V)$ where V is a generalized weak space of dimension α, $V = \bigcup_{i\in I} {}^\alpha U_i^{(p_i)}$ for some non–empty set I and $p_i \in {}^\alpha U_i$, and the ${}^\alpha U_i^{(p_i)}s$'s are pairwise disjoint, hence $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathbf{P}_{i\in I}\wp({}^\alpha U_i^{(p_i)})$. Conversely, assume that $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathbf{P}_{i\in I}\wp({}^\alpha U_i^{(p_i)})$. Then $\mathfrak{B} = \mathbf{P}_{i\in I}\wp({}^\alpha U_i^{(p_i)}) \cong \wp(V)$, where V is the disjoint union of the ${}^\alpha U_i^{(p_i)}s$, is clearly completely representable. By the second item of lemma 4.5, we get that $\mathfrak{A}$ is completely representable, too.

We conclude that $\mathsf{CRK}_\alpha = \mathbf{S_c}\mathbf{P}\mathsf{WFs}_\alpha$, where

$$\mathsf{WFs}_\alpha = \{\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{Ws}_\alpha : A = \wp(V) \text{ for some weak space } V \text{ of dimension } \alpha\}.$$

Note that both of $\mathbf{P}$ and $\mathbf{S}_c$ preserve atomicity. An analogous characterization is obtained in [16, Theorem 18] for relation algebras. The main novelty here is that the characterization lifts to the transfinite replacing set algebras by *weak* set algebras which is a common practice in algebraic logic.

In the last item of theorem 5.1, we will construct an atomless $\mathfrak{C} \in \mathsf{CA}_\omega$ such that for each $2 < n < \omega$, $\mathfrak{B} = \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{C} \in \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega \subseteq \mathsf{RCA}_n$, is atomic but not completely representable (so that by theorem 4.2 $\mathfrak{B}$ has uncountably many atoms). All of the above prompt:

Question: Let α be an ordinal > 2 and let K be any class between Sc and QEA. Is $\mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathsf{K}^{\mathsf{atc}}_{\alpha+\omega} \subseteq \mathsf{CRK}_\alpha$?

We know that the reverse inclusion holds by theorem 4.2. Also in the present context in the polyadic case, the dilations are *quasi-polyadic algebras*, we do not have all substitution operations, the case we dealt with in the previous theorem. The relation algebra analogue of this question is to the best of our knowlege also unsettled. It was posed by Robin Hirsch as [16, Problem 32].

Our next theorem 4.12 collects, refines some known results on neat embeddings and prove slightly new ones particularly in the last item. But first a definition.

Definition 4.11. [28, Definition 5.2.1] Let $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{RCA}_\alpha$. Then $\mathfrak{A}$ has the $UNEP$ (short for unique neat embedding property) if for all $\mathfrak{A}' \in \mathsf{CA}_\alpha$, $\mathfrak{B}$, $\mathfrak{B}' \in \mathsf{CA}_{\alpha+\omega}$, isomorphism $i : \mathfrak{A} \to \mathfrak{A}'$, embeddings $e_A : \mathfrak{A} \to \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathfrak{B}$ and $e_{A'} : \mathfrak{A}' \to \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathfrak{B}'$ such that $\mathfrak{S}g^{\mathfrak{B}}e_A(A) = \mathfrak{B}$ and $\mathfrak{S}g^{\mathfrak{B}'}e_{A'}(A)' = \mathfrak{B}'$, there exists an isomorphism $\bar{i} : \mathfrak{B} \to \mathfrak{B}'$ such that $\bar{i} \circ e_A = e_{A'} \circ i$.

Recall that if $\alpha < \beta$, $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{K}_\alpha$ and $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathfrak{B}$, $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathsf{K}_\beta$, then $\mathfrak{B}$ is called a β–dilation of $\mathfrak{A}$. If $\mathfrak{A}$ generates $\mathfrak{B}$, then $\mathfrak{B}$ is called *minimal β–dilation*, or simply a minimal dilation of $\mathfrak{A}$.

In the second item in the next theorem 4.12, we show that minimal dilations may not be unique up to isomorphisms that fixes the dilated algebra pointwise a result that is proved via a complicated argument using a chain of implications [28, Theorem 5.2.4] aplied to a deep result of Pigozzi's on the failure of the amalgamation property for subvarieties of CA_αs. The proof in *op.cit* does not exhibit explicity the dilated algebra; here we present such an algebra taken from [13].

The first item is proved in [29]. The third item is proved in several publications of the author; a model–theoretic proof for CAs is given in [28] for finite $\alpha > 1$, witness the relevant references in *op.cit* for the rest of the cases. Here we give a uniform proof for $\mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathsf{K}_\beta$ for any pair of ordinals $1 < \alpha < \beta \cap \omega$. The parts on pseudo–elementarity of $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega$, recursvie axiomatizabilty the elementary theory of $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega$ $(1 < n < \omega)$, and non–finite axiomatizability of $\mathbf{El}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega$ for $2 < n < \omega$, formulated (and proved) in the last item are, to the best of our knowledge, new.

From the first item it easily follows that for any $1 < n < m \leq \omega$, $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_m \neq \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_m$. The RA analogue of this result is proved in [16] only for $m = \omega$. It is (to the best of our knowledge) known that for $m > 2$, $\mathfrak{Ra}\mathsf{CA}_m \neq \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Ra}\mathsf{CA}_m \iff m \geq \omega$ [16, Problem 37].

Theorem 4.12. *(1) Let α be any ordinal > 1. Then for every infinite cardinal $\kappa \geq |\alpha|$, there exist completely representable algebras $\mathfrak{B}, \mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{QEA}_\alpha$, that are weak set algebras, such that*

$\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A} = \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{B}$, $|\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{B}| = |\mathfrak{B}| = \kappa$, $\mathfrak{Rd}_{sc}\mathfrak{B} \notin \mathbf{El}\mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathsf{Sc}_{\alpha+1}$, $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{QEA}_\omega$, *and* $\mathfrak{Cm}\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{B} = \mathfrak{A}$, *so that* $|\mathfrak{A}| = 2^\kappa$.

(2) For $\alpha \geq \omega$, there exists an algebra $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{RCA}_\alpha$ that does not have the $UNEP$. In particular, there exists $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{RCA}_\alpha$ that has two minimal $\alpha + \omega$–dilations that are not isomorphic via an isomorphism that fixes $\mathfrak{A}$ pointwise, and dually, there are two non-isomorphic representable algebras of dimension α that generate the same $\alpha + \omega$–dilation.

(3) For any ordinal $\alpha > 1$, and any unountable cardinal $\kappa \geq |\alpha|$, there exist completely representable algebras $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B} \in \mathsf{QEA}_\alpha$, that are weak set algebras, such that $|\mathfrak{A}| = |\mathfrak{B}| = \kappa$, $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathsf{QEA}_{\alpha+\omega}$, $\mathfrak{Rd}_{sc}\mathfrak{B} \notin \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathsf{Sc}_{\alpha+1}$, $\mathfrak{A} \equiv_{\infty,\omega} \mathfrak{B}$ and $\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A} \equiv_{\omega,\infty} \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{B}$. For any algebra $\mathfrak{C}$, such that $\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{B} = \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{C}$, $\mathfrak{C} \equiv_{\infty,\omega} \mathfrak{A}$.

(4) Let everything be as in hypothesis of the previous item. Then there is an $x \in \mathfrak{B}$ such that if $\mathfrak{B} \subseteq \mathfrak{C} (\in \mathsf{K}_\alpha)$, $\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{B} = \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{C}$ and $|\mathfrak{Rl}_x\mathfrak{B}| = |\mathfrak{Rl}_x\mathfrak{C}|$ (relativization here is with respect to the Boolean order), then $\mathfrak{Rd}_{sc}\mathfrak{C} \notin \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{Sc}_{n+1}$. So any algebra $\mathfrak{C} \in \mathsf{QEA}_\alpha$ such that $\mathfrak{B} \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$, $|\mathfrak{Rl}_x\mathfrak{B}| = |\mathfrak{Rl}_x\mathfrak{C}|$ and $\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{B} = \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{C}$, will be in RQEA_α and it will witnesses that $\mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathsf{K}_\beta$ is not closed under $\equiv_{\infty,\omega}$, a fortiori, under $\equiv$

(5) Let $0 < n < m \cap \omega$, where m is an ordinal ($> n$). The class $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_m$ is elementary and pseudo–universal $\iff$ $n \leq 1$. It is closed under $\mathbf{HPUp}$, but for $n > 1$ it is not closed $\mathbf{S}_c$ (hence not closed under $\mathbf{S}$), nor under $\equiv_{\infty,\omega}$ and $\mathbf{Ur}$. $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_m$ is pseudo–elementary and its elementary theory is recursively enumerable. For any $2 < n < \omega$, for any class $\mathbf{K}$, such that $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega \subseteq \mathbf{K} \subseteq \mathsf{RK}_\mathsf{n}$, $\mathbf{ElK}$ is not finitely axiomatizable.

Proof. (1) Fix an infinite cardinal $\kappa \geq |\alpha|$. Let FT_α denote the set of all finite transformations on an ordinal α. Assume that $\alpha > 1$. Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be field of characteristic 0 such that $|\mathfrak{F}| = \kappa$. $V = \{s \in {}^\alpha\mathfrak{F} : |\{i \in \alpha : s_i \neq 0\}| < \omega\}$ and let $\mathfrak{A}$ have universe $\wp(V)$ with the usual concrete operations, Then clearly $\wp(V) \in \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathsf{QEA}_{\alpha+\omega}$. Let y denote the following α-ary relation: $y = \{s \in V : s_0 + 1 = \sum_{i>0} s_i\}$. Let y_s be the singleton containing s, i.e. $y_s = \{s\}$. Define Let $\mathfrak{B} = \mathfrak{Sg}^{\mathfrak{A}}\{y, y_s : s \in y\}$. Clearly $|\mathfrak{B}| = \kappa$. Now clearly $\mathfrak{B}$ and $\mathfrak{A}$ having same top element V share the same atom structure, namely, the singletons. Thus $\mathfrak{Cm}\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{B} = \mathfrak{A}$. Finally, as proved in [29], we have $\mathfrak{Rd}_{sc}\mathfrak{B} \notin \mathbf{E}l\mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathsf{Sc}_{\alpha+1}$.

(2) The second part of this item readily follows from the previous one. We have $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathsf{RCA}_\alpha$ so there exists $\mathfrak{D} \in \mathsf{CA}_{\alpha+\omega}$, such that $\mathfrak{B} \subseteq \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathfrak{D}$, and we can assume that $\mathfrak{B}$ generates $\mathfrak{D}$, so that in fact $\mathfrak{D} \in \mathsf{DcCA}_{\alpha+\omega} \subseteq \mathsf{RCA}_{\alpha+\omega}$. Then $\mathfrak{B}$ and $\mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathfrak{D}$ are non-isomorphic algebras, since $\mathfrak{B}$ is not in $\mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathsf{CA}_{\alpha+1} \supseteq \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathsf{CA}_{\alpha+\omega}$, but they generate the same dilation $\mathfrak{D}$.

Now for the first part of this item, we will be sketchy. Details can be found in [13]. Let $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{Fr}_4\mathsf{CA}_\alpha$ with $\{x, y, z, w\}$ its free generators. Let $X_1 = \{x, y\}$ and $X_2 = \{x, z, w\}$. Let r, s and t be defined as follows:

$$r = \mathsf{c}_0(x \cdot \mathsf{c}_1 y) \cdot \mathsf{c}_0(x \cdot -\mathsf{c}_1 y),$$

$$s = \mathsf{c}_0\mathsf{c}_1(\mathsf{c}_1 z \cdot \mathsf{s}_1^0\mathsf{c}_1 z \cdot -\mathsf{d}_{01}) + \mathsf{c}_0(x \cdot -\mathsf{c}_1 z),$$

$$t = \mathsf{c}_0\mathsf{c}_1(\mathsf{c}_1 w \cdot \mathsf{s}_1^0\mathsf{c}_1 w \cdot -\mathsf{d}_{01}) + \mathsf{c}_0(x \cdot -\mathsf{c}_1 w),$$

where $x, y, z,$ and w are the first four free generators of $\mathfrak{A}$. Then $r \leq s \cdot t$. Let $\mathfrak{D} = \mathfrak{Fr}_4\mathsf{RCA}_\alpha$ with free generators $\{x', y', z', w'\}$. Let $\psi : \mathfrak{A} \to \mathfrak{D}$ be defined by the extension of the map $t \mapsto t'$, for

$t \in \{x, y, x, w\}$. For $i \in \mathfrak{A}$, we denote $\psi(i) \in \mathfrak{D}$ by i'. Let $I = \mathfrak{Ig}^{\mathfrak{D}^{(X_1)}}\{r'\}$ and $J = \mathfrak{Ig}^{\mathfrak{D}^{(X_2)}}\{s'.t'\}$, and let

$$L = I \cap \mathfrak{D}^{(X_1 \cap X_2)} \text{ and } K = J \cap \mathfrak{D}^{(X_1 \cap X_2)}.$$

Then $L = K$, and $\mathfrak{A}_0 = \mathfrak{D}^{(X_1 \cap X_2)}/L$ can be embedded into $\mathfrak{A}_1 = \mathfrak{D}^{(X_1)}/I$ and $\mathfrak{A}_2 = \mathfrak{D}^{(X_2)}/J$, but there is no amalgam even in CA_ω. If $\mathfrak{A}_0$ has the unique neat embedding property that it lies in the amalgamation base of RCA_α [28]. Hence the algebra $\mathfrak{A}_0$ does not have the unique neat embedding property. More generally, if $\mathfrak{D}_\beta$ is taken as the free RCA_α on β generators, so that our algebra in the previous theorem is just $\mathfrak{D}_4$, where $\beta \geq 4$, then the algebra constructed from $\mathfrak{D}_\beta$ as above, will not have the unique neat embedding property. Now using the chain of implications in [28, Theorem 5.2.4], we get the result in the first part differently, since the negation of item(iv) in the cited theorem taking $L = \mathsf{RCA}_\alpha$ is true, and this implies the negation of the first, which, in turn, easily implies the required.

(3) We start by giving the general idea for the CAs case when $1 < \alpha < \omega$ paving the way for a general proof that addresses simultaneously any K between Sc and PEA. The α–dimensional set algebras $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B}$ constructed in [28, Theorem 5.1.4] can be modified to be atomic by requiring that the interpretation of the uncountably –many tenary relations taken to have cardinality κ in the model M constructed in [28, Lemma 5.3.1] are disjoint (not only distinct). Then $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$ will be also completely representable, $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathsf{CA}_\omega$, $\mathfrak{B} \notin \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathsf{CA}_{\alpha+1}$, and $\mathfrak{A} \equiv_{\omega,\infty} \mathfrak{B}$. We now give a unified proof that for any K such that $\mathsf{Sc} \subseteq \mathsf{K} \subseteq \mathsf{QEA}$, for any $1 < n < \beta \cap \omega$, the class $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\beta$ is not elementary. Fix $1 < n < \omega$. Let L be a signature consisting of the unary relation symbols $P_0, P_1, \ldots, P_{n-1}$ and uncountably many n–ary predicate symbols. M is as in [28, Lemma 5.1.3], but the tenary relations are replaced by n–ary ones, and we require that the interpretations of the n–ary relations in M are *pairwise disjoint* not only distinct. This can be fixed. In addition to pairwise disjointness of n–ary relations, we require their symmetry, that is, permuting the variables does not change their semantics.

For $u \in {}^n n$, let χ_u be the formula $\bigwedge_{u \in {}^n n} P_{u_i}(x_i)$. We assume that the n–ary relation symbols are indexed by (an uncountable set) I and that there is a binary operation $+$ on I, such that $(I, +)$ is an abelian group, and for distinct $i \neq j \in I$, we have $R_i \circ R_j = R_{i+j}$. For $n \leq k \leq \omega$, let $\mathfrak{A}_k = \{\phi^{\mathsf{M}} : \phi \in L_k\}(\subseteq \wp({}^k\mathsf{M}))$, where ϕ is taken in the signature L, and $\phi^{\mathsf{M}} = \{s \in {}^k\mathsf{M} : \mathsf{M} \models \phi[s]\}$.

Let $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{A}_n$, then $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{Pes_n}$ by the added symmetry condition. Also $\mathfrak{A} \cong \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{A}_\omega$; the isomorphism is given by $\phi^{\mathsf{M}} \mapsto \phi^{\mathsf{M}}$. The map is obviously an injective homomorphism; it is surjective, because M (as stipulated in [28, item (1) of lemma 5.1.3]), has quantifier elimination.

For $u \in {}^n n$, let $\mathfrak{A}_u = \{x \in \mathfrak{A} : x \leq \chi_u^{\mathsf{M}}\}$. Then $\mathfrak{A}_u$ is an uncountable and atomic Boolean algebra (atomicity follows from the new disjointness condition) and $\mathfrak{A}_u \cong \mathsf{Cof}(|I|)$, the finite–cofinite Boolean algebra on $|I|$. Define a map $f : \mathfrak{Bl}\mathfrak{A} \to \mathbf{P}_{u \in {}^n n}\mathfrak{A}_u$, by $f(a) = \langle a \cdot \chi_u \rangle_{u \in {}^n n+1}$.

Let $\mathfrak{P}$ denote the structure for the signature of Boolean algebras expanded by constant symbols 1_u, $u \in {}^n n$, d_{ij}, and unary relation symbols $\mathsf{s}_{[i,j]}$ for each $i, j \in n$. Then for each $i < j < n$, there are quantifier free formulas $\eta_i(x, y)$ and $\eta_{ij}(x, y)$ such that $\mathfrak{P} \models \eta_i(f(a), b) \iff b = f(\mathsf{c}_i^{\mathfrak{A}}a)$, and $\mathfrak{P} \models \eta_{ij}(f(a), b) \iff b = f(\mathsf{s}_{[i,j]}a)$.

The one corresponding to cylindrifiers is exactly like the CA case [28, pp.113-114]. For substitutions corresponding to transpositions, it is simply $y = \mathsf{s}_{[i,j]}x$. The diagonal elements and the Boolean operations are easy to interpret. Hence, $\mathfrak{P}$ is interpretable in $\mathfrak{A}$, and the interpretation is one dimensional and quantifier free. For $v \in {}^n n$, by the Tarski–Skölem downward theorem, let $\mathfrak{B}_v$ be a countable elementary subalgebra of $\mathfrak{A}_v$. (Here we are using the countable signature of PEA_n). Let $S_n(\subseteq {}^n n)$ be the set of permuations in ${}^n n$.

Take $u_1 = (0, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$ and $u_2 = (1, 0, 0, \dots, 0) \in {}^n n$. Let $v = \tau(u_1, u_2)$ where $\tau(x, y) = \mathsf{c}_1(\mathsf{c}_0 x \cdot \mathsf{s}_1^0 \mathsf{c}_1 y) \cdot \mathsf{c}_1 x \cdot \mathsf{c}_0 y$. We call τ an approximate witness. It is not hard to show that $\tau(u_1, u_2)$ is actually the composition of u_1 and u_2, so that $\tau(u_1, u_2)$ is the constant zero map; which we denote by $\mathbf{0}$; it is also in ${}^n n$. Clearly for every $i < j < n$, ${\mathsf{s}_{[i,j]}}^{{}^n n}\{\mathbf{0}\} = \mathbf{0} \notin \{u_1, u_2\}$.

We can assume without loss that the Boolean reduct of $\mathfrak{A}$ is the following product:

$$\mathfrak{A}_{u_1} \times \mathfrak{A}_{u_2} \times \mathfrak{A}_{\mathbf{0}} \times \mathbf{P}_{u \in V \sim J} \mathfrak{A}_u,$$

where $J = \{u_1, u_2, \mathbf{0}\}$. Let

$$\mathfrak{B} = ((\mathfrak{A}_{u_1} \times \mathfrak{A}_{u_2} \times \mathfrak{B}_{\mathbf{0}} \times \mathbf{P}_{u \in V \sim J} \mathfrak{A}_u), 1_u, \mathsf{d}_{ij}, \mathsf{s}_{[i,j]} x)_{i,j<n},$$

inheriting the same interpretation. Then by the Feferman–Vaught theorem, we get that $\mathfrak{B} \equiv \mathfrak{A}$. Now assume for contradiction, that $\mathfrak{Rd}_{sc} \mathfrak{B} = \mathfrak{Nr}_n \mathfrak{D}$, with $\mathfrak{D} \in \mathsf{Sc}_{n+1}$. Let $\tau_n(x, y)$, which we call an *n–witness*, be defined by $\mathsf{c}_n(\mathsf{s}_n^1 \mathsf{c}_n x \cdot \mathsf{s}_n^0 \mathsf{c}_n y)$. By a straightforward, but possibly tedious computation, one can obtain $\mathsf{Sc}_{n+1} \models \tau_n(x, y) \leq \tau(x, y)$ so that the approximate witness *dominates* the n–witness.

The term $\tau(x, y)$ does not use any spare dimensions, and it 'approximates' the term $\tau_n(x, y)$ that uses the spare dimension n. The algebra $\mathfrak{A}$ can be viewed as splitting the atoms of the atom structure $({}^n n, \equiv, \equiv_{ij}, D_{ij})_{i,j<n}$ each to uncountably many atoms. On the other hand, $\mathfrak{B}$ can be viewed as splitting the same atom structure, each atom – except for one atom that is split into countably many atoms – is also split into uncountably many atoms (the same as in $\mathfrak{A}$).

On the 'global' level, namely, in the complex algebra of the finite (splitted) atom structure ${}^n n$, these two terms are equal, the approximate witness is the n–witness. The complex algebra $\mathfrak{Cm}({}^n n)$ does not 'see' the nth dimension. But in the algebras $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$, obtained after splitting, the n–witness becomes then a *genuine witness*, not an approximate one. The approximate witness *strictly dominates* the n–witness. The n–witness using the spare dimension n, detects the cardinality twist that $L_{\infty,\omega}$, *a priori*, first order logic misses out on. If the n–witness were term definable (in the case we have a full neat reduct of an algebra in only one extra dimension), then it takes two uncountable component to an uncountable one, and this is not possible for $\mathfrak{B}$, because in $\mathfrak{B}$, the target component is forced to be countable.

Now for $x \in \mathfrak{B}_{u_1}$ and $y \in \mathfrak{B}_{u_2}$, we have

$$\tau_n^{\mathfrak{D}}(x, y) \leq \tau_n^{\mathfrak{D}}(\chi_{u_1}, \chi_{u_2}) \leq \tau^{\mathfrak{D}}(\chi_{u_1}, \chi_{u_2}) = \chi_{\tau^{\wp({}^n n)}}(u_1, u_2) = \chi_{\tau(u_1, u_2)} = \chi_{\mathbf{0}}.$$

But for $i \neq j \in I$, $\tau_n^{\mathfrak{D}}(R_i^{\mathsf{M}} \cdot \chi_{u_1}, R_j^{\mathsf{M}} \cdot \chi_{u_2}) = R_{i+j}^{\mathsf{M}} \cdot \chi_v$, and so $\mathfrak{B}_{\mathbf{0}}$ will be uncountable, which is impossible.

We now show that $\exists$ has a winning strategy in an Ehrenfeucht–Fraïssé back–and–forth game over the now atomic $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B})$. At any stage of the game, if $\forall$ places a pebble on one of $\mathfrak{A}$ or $\mathfrak{B}$, $\exists$ must place a matching pebble on the other algebra. Let $\bar{a} = \langle a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{m-1} \rangle$ be the position of the pebbles played so far (by either player) on $\mathfrak{A}$ and let $\bar{b} = \langle b_0, \dots, b_{m-1} \rangle$ be the the position of the pebbles played on $\mathfrak{B}$.

Denote χ_u^{M}, by $\mathbf{1}_u$. Then $\exists$ has to maintain the following properties throughout the game:

- for any atom x (of either algebra) with $x \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{0}} = 0$, , then $x \in a_i$ iff $x \in b_i$,
- $\bar{a}$ induces a finite partition of $\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{0}}$ in $\mathfrak{A}$ of 2^m (possibly empty) parts $p_i : i < 2^m$ and the $\bar{b}$ induces a partition of 1_u in $\mathfrak{B}$ of parts $q_i : i < 2^m$ such that p_i is finite iff q_i is finite and, in this case, $|p_i| = |q_i|$.

It is easy to see that $\exists$ can maintain these two properties in every round. In this back–and–forth game, $\exists$ will always find a matching pebble, because the pebbles in play are finite. For each $w \in {}^n n$ the component $\mathfrak{B}_w = \{x \in \mathfrak{B} : x \leq \mathbf{1}_v\} (\subseteq \mathfrak{A}_w = \{x \in \mathfrak{A} : x \leq \mathbf{1}_v\})$ contains infinitely many atoms. For any $w \in V$, $|\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}_w| = |I|$, while for $u \in V \sim \{\mathbf{0}\}$, $\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}_u = \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{B}_u$. For $|\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{B}_{\mathbf{0}}| = \omega$, but it is still an infinite set. Therefore $\mathfrak{A} \equiv_\infty \mathfrak{B}$.

It is clear that the above argument works for any $\mathfrak{C}$ such that $\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{C} = \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{B}$, hence $\mathfrak{B} \equiv_{\infty,\omega} \mathfrak{C}$.

(4) Take $x = \mathbf{1_0}$. If $\mathfrak{B} \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$, $\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{B} = \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{C}$ and $|\mathfrak{Rl}_x\mathfrak{C}| = |\mathfrak{Rl}_x\mathfrak{B}| = \omega$, then the same 'cardinality twist' used above works for $\mathfrak{C}$, because $u, u' \in {}^n n$, $\mathbf{1}_u \cap \mathbf{1}_{u'} = \emptyset$ and for $u \in {}^n n \sim \{\mathbf{0}\}$, $\mathfrak{Rl}_{\mathbf{1}_u}\mathfrak{B} \subseteq \mathfrak{Rl}_{\mathbf{1}_u}\mathfrak{C}$, so $|\mathfrak{Rl}_{\mathbf{1}_u}\mathfrak{C}| > \omega$. More explicitly, assume for contadiction that $\mathfrak{Rd}_{sc}\mathfrak{C} \in \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{Sc}_{n+3}$. The genuine witness then witnesses that $|\mathfrak{Rl}_{\mathbf{1_0}}\mathfrak{C}| > \omega$, which is a contradiction.

(5) For $1 < n < m \cap \omega$, the class $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_m$ is not elementary, hence not pseudo–universal. For $n \leq 1$, and $m > n$, $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_m = \mathsf{K}_n$ is a (finitely axiomatizable) variety. Closure under $\mathbf{P}$ and $\mathbf{Up}$ is easy, by noting that if $(\mathfrak{A}_i : i \in I)$ is a family of K_ms, I a non-empty indexing set, U an ultrafilter on I, then $\mathbf{P}_{i\in I}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{A}_i = \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathbf{P}_{i\in I}\mathfrak{A}_i$ and $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\Pi_{i/U}\mathfrak{A}_i \cong \Pi_{i/U}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{A}_i$. (All results in this paragraph formulate for $1 < n < m \cap \omega$, works for any pair of ordinals $1 < \alpha < \beta$ with same proofs).

Since for $1 < n < m \cap \omega$, the class $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_m$ is not elementary, and it is closed under $\mathbf{Up}$, then by the Keisler–Shelah ultrapower theorem, it is not closed under $\mathbf{Ur}$.

Closure under $\mathbf{H}$ is not as easy as $\mathbf{P}$ and $\mathbf{Up}$. We might as well prove it for any pair of ordinals $\alpha < \beta$, because again the proof is the same for any such pair. Let $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathfrak{C}$ with $\mathfrak{C} \in \mathsf{K}_\beta$, and let $h : \mathfrak{A} \to \mathfrak{B}$ be a surjective homomorphism. We can assume that $\mathfrak{C}$ is generated by $\mathfrak{A}$. Let $I = ker f$, it suffices to to show that $\mathfrak{A}/I \in \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathsf{K}_\beta$. Let J be the ideal of $\mathfrak{C}$ generated by I. Then $I = J \cap \mathfrak{A}$ [15, Theorem 2.6.71, and Remark 2.6.73]. Obviously, $\mathfrak{B} \cong \mathfrak{A}/I \subseteq \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha(\mathfrak{C}/J)$. Now we will show that this last inclusion is not a proper one, by which we will be done.

Let $x \in \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha(\mathfrak{C}/J)$, $x = c/J$ say, with $c \in \mathfrak{C}$. Then Δc uses only finitly many dimensions in $\beta \sim \alpha$, because $\mathfrak{A}$ generates $\mathfrak{C}$. Let Γ be this finite set, and put $c' = \mathsf{c}_{(\Gamma)}c$. Then clearly $c' \in A$ and $x = c/I = c'/J$. Hence, $\mathfrak{B} = \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha(\mathfrak{C}/J)$, so that, as required, the inclusion is not a proper one.

For $n > 1$, $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_m$ is not closed under $\mathbf{S}_c$, hence under $\mathbf{S}$ since $\mathfrak{Rd}_\mathsf{K}\mathfrak{B}$ completely representable, hence by theorem 4.2 it is in $\mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega \subseteq \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_{n+k}$ for any $k \leq \omega$. On the other hand, $\mathfrak{Rd}_\mathsf{K}\mathfrak{B}$ is not in $\mathbf{El}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_{n+1} \supseteq \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega$.

For pseudo–elementarity (for any finite n), one easily adapts [16, Theorem 21] by defining $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_m$ in a two–sorted theory, when $1 < n < m < \omega$, and a three-sorted one, when $1 < n < m$ where m is infinite. The first part is easy. For the second part; one uses a sort for a K_n (c), the second sort is for the Boolean reduct of a K_n (b) and the third sort for a set of dimensions (δ).

For any infinite ordinal β, the defining theory for $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\beta = \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega$, includes sentences requiring that the constants i^δ for $i < \omega$ are distinct and that the last two sorts define a K_ω. There is a function I^b from sort c to sort b and sentences forcing that I^b is injective and respects the K_n operations. For example, for all x^c $I^b(\mathsf{c}_i x^c) = \mathsf{c}^b_i(I^b(x^c))$. The last requirement is that I^b maps *onto* the set of n dimensional elements. This can be easily expressed via

$$\forall y^b((\forall z^\delta(z^\delta \neq 0^\delta, \dots (n-1)^\delta \implies c^b(z^\delta, y^b) = y^b)) \iff \exists x^c(y^b = I^b(x^c))).$$

In all cases, it is clear that any algebra of the right type is the first sort of a model of this theory. Conversely, a model for this theory will consist of an K_n (sort c), and a K algebra whose dimension is the cardinality of the δ-sorted elements which is infinite. Thus this three–sorted theory defines the class of neat reducts; furthermore, it is clearly recursive. The rest follows from [19, Theorem 9.37].

Now we prove non–finite axiomatizability of $\mathbf{ElK}$ for any class $\mathbf{K}$ between $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega$ and $\mathsf{RK_n}$ for $2 < n < \omega$. Note that the inclusion $\mathbf{El}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega \subseteq \mathsf{RK_n}$ is proper by first item of theorem 4.12 for any $n > 1$. Fix $2 < n < \omega$ and $\mathbf{K}$ as specified above. For $3 \leq n, i < \omega$, with $n - 1 \leq i$, $\mathfrak{C}_{n,i}$ denotes the finite PEA_n associated with the cylindric atom structure as defined on [15, pp. 95]. Then by [15, Theorem 3.2.79] for $3 \leq n$, and $j < \omega$, $\mathfrak{Rd}_3\mathfrak{C}_{n,n+j}$ can be neatly embedded in a PEA_{3+j+1} (1).

By [15, Theorem 3.2.84]), we have for every $j \in \omega$, there is an $3 \leq n$ such that $\mathfrak{Rd}_{df}\mathfrak{Rd}_3\mathfrak{C}_{n,n+j}$ is a non–representable $\mathsf{Df_3}$ (2).

Now suppose that $m \in \omega$. By (2), there is a $j \in \omega \sim 3$ so that $\mathfrak{Rd}_{df}\mathfrak{Rd}_3\mathfrak{C}_{j,j+m+n-4}$ is not a representable $\mathsf{Df_3}$.

By (1) we have $\mathfrak{Rd}_3\mathfrak{C}_{j,j+m+n-4} \subseteq \mathfrak{Nr}_3\mathfrak{B}_m$, for some $\mathfrak{B}_m \in \mathsf{PEA}_{n+m}$. We can assume that $\mathfrak{Rd}_3\mathfrak{C}_{j,j+m+n-4}$ generates $\mathfrak{B}_m$, so that $\mathfrak{B}_m$ is finite. Put $\mathfrak{A}_m = \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{B}_m$, then $\mathfrak{A}_m$ is finite, too, and $\mathfrak{Rd}_{df}\mathfrak{A}_m$ is not representable, *a fortiori* $\mathfrak{Rd}_\mathsf{K}\mathfrak{A}_m \notin \mathsf{RK_n}$. Therefore $\mathfrak{Rd}_\mathsf{K}\mathfrak{A}_m \notin \mathbf{El}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega$.

Let $\mathfrak{C}_m$ be an algebra similar to QEA_ω's such that $\mathfrak{B}_m = \mathfrak{Rd}_{n+m}\mathfrak{C}_m$. Then $\mathfrak{A}_m = \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{C}_m$. (Note that $\mathfrak{C}_m$ cannot belong to QEA_ω for else $\mathfrak{A}_m$ will be representable). If F is a non–trivial ultrafilter on ω, we have

$$\Pi_{m\in\omega}\mathfrak{A}_m/F = \Pi_{m\in\omega}(\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{C}_m)/F = \mathfrak{Nr}_n(\Pi_{m\in\omega}\mathfrak{C}_m/F).$$

But $\Pi_{m\in\omega}\mathfrak{C}_m/F \in \mathsf{QEA}_\omega$, we conclude that $\mathsf{K}_n \sim \mathbf{ElK}$ is not closed under ultraproducts, because $\mathfrak{Rd}_{sc}\mathfrak{A}_m \notin \mathsf{RSc}_n \supseteq \mathbf{El}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{Sc}_\omega$ and $\Pi_{m\in\omega}\mathfrak{A}_m/F \in \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{QEA}_\omega \subseteq \mathbf{ElK}$.

□

5 Main Theorem

In what follows, unless otherwise explicitly indicated, K *denotes any class between* Sc *and* PEA.

Let m be finite > 2. Recall that the finitely axiomatizable variety $\mathsf{G_m}$ consists of set algebras whose top elements are of the form $V \subseteq {}^mU$, such that if $s \in V$ and $\tau : m \to m$, then $s \circ \tau \in V$ [14].

For $2 < n < m \leq \omega$, let $\mathbf{L}_{n,m} = \mathsf{PEA}_n \cap \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{G}_m$. Notice that $\mathsf{RPEA_n} \subseteq \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_\mathsf{n}\mathsf{PEA_m} \subseteq \mathbf{L_{n,m}}$, because $\mathsf{PEA}_m \subseteq \mathsf{G}_m$ [14], and we will prove next that the inclusions are all proper. In fact, it can also be proved using sophisticated rainbow constructions that $\mathbf{L}_{n,m}$ is *not finitely axiomatizable* over $\mathbf{L}_{n,m+1}$, cf. [19, Section 17.4] for the RA analogue. It will be proved below that $\mathbf{L}_{n,m}$ is a canonical variety, and that $\mathbf{L}_{n,m} = \{\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{PEA}_n : \mathfrak{A}$ has an m–square representation$\}$.

In the first item of the next theorem, we prove the CA analogue of the main result in formulated in [16, Theorem 45] corrected in [17] in the way to be recalled next. Addressing relation algebras, the corrected result states that any class $\mathbf{K}$ such that $\mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Ra}\mathsf{CA}_\omega \subseteq \mathbf{K} \subseteq \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Ra}\mathsf{CA}_5$ is not elementary. The proof presented in [16] does not allow us to remove $\mathbf{S}_c$ from the left hand side, like was mistakenly stated in [16]. In particular, it is *still not known* whether $\mathfrak{Ra}\mathsf{CA}_\omega$, or for that matter $\mathfrak{Ra}\mathsf{CA}_n$ for finite $n > 2$, is elementary or not. However, as shown in theorem 4.12, the analogous result (and much more) for many cylindric-like algebras is known. Indeed, for any pair of ordinals $1 < \alpha < \beta$ (infinite included), for any K between Sc and PEA, the class $\mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathsf{K}_\beta$ is not elementary.

If $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{CRK_n}$, then there exists by theorem 4.2 a completely additive atomic (dilation) $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathsf{K}_\omega$, such that $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{B}$, so the that inclusion $\mathsf{CRK_n} \subseteq \mathbf{S_c}\mathfrak{Nr}_\mathsf{n}\mathsf{K}^\mathsf{ad}_\mathsf{n+3}$ stipulated in the first item is valid. Furthermore, it is proper by [23], where in the proof of [23, Theorem 1.1], for each $2 < n < m < \omega$, a finite algebra $\mathfrak{A}(n, m)$ is constructed such that $\mathfrak{A}(n, m) \in \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{PEA}_m$,

and $\mathfrak{Rd}_{sc}\mathfrak{A}(n,m) \notin \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{Sc}_{m+1}$. Suppose that $\mathfrak{A}(n,m) = \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D}$, $\mathfrak{D} \in \mathsf{PEA}_m$, and we can assume that $\mathfrak{A}(n,m)$ generates $\mathfrak{D}$, so that $\mathfrak{D}$ is finite, hence $\mathfrak{Rd}_{\mathsf{K}}\mathfrak{D}$ is completely additive. Thus $\mathfrak{Rd}_{\mathsf{K}}\mathfrak{A}(n,m) \in \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_m^{\mathsf{ad}} \subseteq \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_m^{\mathsf{ad}}$ but $\mathfrak{Rd}_{\mathsf{K}}\mathfrak{A}(n,m) \notin \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_m \supseteq \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_m \supseteq \mathsf{CRK}_n$. The last $\supseteq$ follows from theorem 4.2.

In item (2), we show that is $\mathbf{L}_{n,m}$ for $2 < n < m < \omega$ and $m \geq n+3$, is *not* atom–canonical, and in item (3) we show that $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_m\mathsf{PEA}_n$ is not finitely axiomatizable over $\mathbf{L}_{m,n}$. Other (strongly related) results proved in item (2) solve an open problem originating with the present author, first announced by Hirsch and Hodkinson in [19, Problem 12, pp.637] and re–appearing in [6], cf. [27, pp.131].

The results proved in the first and second items strengthen substantially the classical results in [24, 18] on the notions of atom–canonicity and complete representations for the class RCA_n $(2 < n < \omega)$, respectively. Our results address the (strict) approximations $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_{n+k}$ and $\mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_{n+k}$ for $k \geq 3$, together with their K analogues, for any K between Sc and PEA.

Ourr construction in the second item, showing that, for $2 < n < \omega$ and $k \geq 3$, $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_{n+k}$ is not atom–canonical, has affinity to the proofs of lemmata [19, 17.32, 17.34, 17.36], exhibiting a typical *blow up and blur construction* in the sense of [8] for rainbow relation algebras proving that $\mathbf{S}\mathsf{RaCA}_{\mathsf{k}}$, $k \geq 6$ is not atom–canonical, but the term blow up and blur is not used there.

One might be tempted to obtain the result in this item by lifting the construction of relation algebra analogue, using the construction of Hodkinson in [25], which constructs CAs (of every finite dimension > 2) from atom structures of RAs.

But we hasten to add that this *cannot be done* with the construction in [25] as it stands, because the atomic RA does not embed in Ra reduct of the atomic CA_n constructed from it, if $n \geq 6$. Furthermore, there cannot be a lifting argument that associates to *any* given relation algebra R an n–dimensional $\mathfrak{B}_n \in \mathsf{CA}_n$ for every $n \geq 3$, such that $\mathsf{R} \subseteq \mathfrak{Ra}\mathfrak{B}_n$, for then if one starts with a non-representable $\mathsf{R} \in \mathsf{RA}$, then $\mathsf{R} \in \bigcap_{n\geq 3} \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Ra}\mathsf{CA}_n$ which means that $\mathsf{R} \in \mathsf{RRA}$. Since the relation algebra on which the construction in lemmata [19, 17.32, 17.34, 17.36] hinges is not representable, we have decided to start from scratch blowing up and bluring a finite rainbow CA_n.

Nevertheless, our construction relies on the model–theoretic construction in [24], except that the latter is *not* a blow up and blur construction.

Now we are ready for:

Theorem 5.1. *Unless otherwise indicated, n will be a finite ordinal > 2.*

(1) (a) If $m \geq n+3$, then $\mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_m^{\mathsf{ad}}$ is not elementary. In fact, any class $\mathbf{K}$, such that $\mathsf{CRK}_{\mathsf{n}} \subseteq \mathbf{K} \subseteq \mathbf{S}_{\mathsf{c}}\mathfrak{Nr}_{\mathsf{n}}\mathsf{K}_{\mathsf{m}}^{\mathsf{ad}}$, is not elementary. In particular, if K has a CA reduct, then any $\mathbf{K}$ such that $\mathsf{CRK}_{\mathsf{n}} \subseteq \mathbf{K} \subseteq \mathbf{S}_{\mathsf{c}}\mathfrak{Nr}_{\mathsf{n}}\mathsf{K}_{\mathsf{m}}$ is not elementary. For QAs, we can replace $\mathsf{QA}_m^{\mathsf{ad}}$ by $\{\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{QA}_m : \mathsf{s}_0^1$ is completely additive in $\mathfrak{A}\}$.

(2) Let $\mathbf{N} = \{\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{K}_n^{\mathsf{ad}} \cap \mathsf{At} : \mathfrak{Cm}\mathsf{At} \in \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega\}$. Then $\mathbf{N} \neq \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega \cap \mathsf{At}$, $\mathbf{N} \subseteq \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega^{\mathsf{ad}} \cap \mathsf{At}$, $\mathbf{N} \cap \mathsf{Count} \subseteq \mathsf{CRK}_{\mathsf{n}}$; the last two inclusions are proper, and $\mathbf{N}$ is not elementary. If $\mathbf{K}_1 = \mathsf{CRK}_n \cap \mathbf{El}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega$ and $\mathbf{K}_2 = \mathbf{S}_{\mathsf{c}}\mathfrak{Nr}_{\mathsf{n}}\mathsf{K}_\omega \cap \mathbf{El}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega \cap \mathsf{At}$, then these are distinct classes that lie strictly between $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega$ and $\mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega$, but $\mathbf{K}_1$ and $\mathbf{K}_2$ coincide on algebras having countably many atoms.

(3) The varieties $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_m$ and $\mathbf{L}_{n,m}$ are not atom–canonical, when $m \geq n+3$. In fact, there exists a countable, simple, atomic $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{RPEA}_{\mathsf{n}}$ (so that $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathbf{IPes}_{\mathsf{n}}$), such that $\mathfrak{Cm}\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{Rd}_{sc}\mathfrak{A} \notin \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{Sc}_{n+3}$ and $\mathfrak{Cm}\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A} \notin \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{G}_{n+3}$.

(4) Let α be any ordinal > 2 possibly infinite. Then for any $r \in \omega$, and $k \geq 1$, there exists $\mathfrak{A}_r \in \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathsf{QEA}_{\alpha+k}$ such that $\mathfrak{Rd}_{ca}\mathfrak{A}_r \notin \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathsf{CA}_{\alpha+k+1}$ and $\Pi_{r/U}\mathfrak{A}_r \in \mathsf{RQEA}_\alpha$ for any non–principal ultrafilter U on ω. For any $k \geq 3$, the variety $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathsf{K}_{\alpha+k}$ is not atom–canonical and for any $2 < n < m < \omega$, the variety $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{PEA}_m$ is not finitely axiomatizable over $\mathbf{L}_{n,m}$.

(5) For any ordinal $\alpha > 2$, there exists an atomic algebra $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathsf{K}_{\alpha+\omega}$ that is not completely representable. For finite dimensions, such algebras are constructed uniformly from one relation algebra R possessing an ω–dimensional basis. More precisely, for any cardinal κ there exists an atomless $\mathfrak{C} \in \mathsf{QEA}_\omega$, and an atomic relation algebra R having 2^κ many atoms, with no complete representation, such that $\mathsf{R} = \mathfrak{Ra}\mathfrak{C}$, and for all $n < \omega$, $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{C} \in \mathbf{El}\mathsf{CRK}_n$ (hence it is atomic), but the Df reduct of $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{C}$ does not have a complete representation $\iff n > 2$; for $n \leq 2$, $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{C} \in \mathsf{CRQEA}_n$. Hence for $2 < n < \omega$, $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}^{\mathsf{ad}}_\omega \cap \mathsf{At} \nsubseteq \mathsf{CRK}_n$.

Proof. **Proof of (1)**: We use a rainbow construction inspired by the rainbow construction in [16] for relation algebras. We will show that any class L between CRK_n and $\mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}^{\mathsf{ad}}_{n+3}$ is not elementary. From our construction, we will get that CRDf_n is not elementary, too.

The proof consists of three parts:

- In the first part, we construct a representable (atomic) rainbow–like algebra based on $\mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbb{N}$ viewed as relational structures with usual order, denoted below by $\mathsf{PEA}_{\mathbb{Z},\mathbb{N}}$ and show that $\exists$ has a winning strategy in $G_k(\mathsf{At}\mathsf{PEA}_{\mathbb{Z},\mathbb{N}})$ for each finite k.
- In the second part, we show that $\forall$ has a winning strategy in the ω–rounded game F^{n+3} played on atomic networks (coloured graphs) of $\mathsf{PEA}_{\mathbb{Z},\mathbb{N}}$.
- In the third part, we use the winning strategy of $\exists$ in a game stronger than G_k denoted below by H_k (for each $k \in \omega$) to obtain finer results.

Let $\mathfrak{A}$ be the n–dimensional rainbow cylindric algebra $R(\Gamma)$ [22, Definition 3.6.9] where $\Gamma = \omega$, the reds are the set $\mathsf{R} = \{\mathsf{r}_{ij} : i < j < \omega\}$, and the greens $\mathsf{G} = \{\mathsf{g}_i : 1 \leq i < n-1\} \cup \{\mathsf{g}^i_0 : i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, but we have a new forbidden triple connecting two greens and one red, namely, the triple $(\mathsf{g}^i_0, \mathsf{g}^j_0, \mathsf{r}_{kl})$ is forbidden, unless $(i,k),(j,l)$ is an order preserving partial function from $\mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{N}$ with the usual order $<$. Here we identify ω with $\mathbb{N}$.

We will refer to this new rainbow–like algebra of dimension n by $\mathsf{PEA}_{\mathbb{Z},\mathbb{N}}$ (not only in this item). Adapting the technique in [16], we start by showing that $\exists$ has a winning strategy in G_k for all finite k, hence, using ultrapowers followed by an elementary chain argument, we obtain $\mathfrak{B}$ such $\mathsf{PEA}_{\mathbb{Z},\mathbb{N}} \equiv \mathfrak{B}$ and $\exists$ has a winning strategy in G on $\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{B}$, so by [22, Theorem 3.3.3], $\mathfrak{B}$ is completely representable, thus by theorem 4.2, we get that $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{PEA}_{n+3}$.

This known argument of forming ultrapowers followed by an elementary chain argument in rainbow constructions will be used several times below, so we briefly give the idea. For brevity let $\mathfrak{C} = \mathsf{PEA}_{\mathbb{Z},\mathbb{N}}$. Now for $k < \omega$, $\exists$ has a winning strategy σ_k in $G_k(\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{C})$. We can assume that σ_k is deterministic. Let $\mathfrak{D}$ be a non–principal ultrapower of $\mathfrak{C}$. Then $\exists$ has a winning strategy σ in $G(\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{D})$ — essentially she uses σ_k in the k'th component of the ultraproduct so that at each round of $G(\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{D})$, $\exists$ is still winning in co-finitely many components, this suffices to show she has still not lost.

We can also assume that $\mathfrak{C}$ is countable. If not then replace it by its subalgebra generated by the countably many atoms (the term algebra); winning strategy s here will depend only on the atom structure, so they persist for both players. Now one can use an elementary chain argument to construct countable elementary subalgebras $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{A}_0 \preceq \mathfrak{A}_1 \preceq \ldots \preceq \ldots \mathfrak{D}$ in this manner. One

defines $\mathfrak{A}_{i+1}$ be a countable elementary subalgebra of $\mathfrak{D}$ containing $\mathfrak{A}_i$ and all elements of $\mathfrak{D}$ that σ selects in a play of $G(\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{D})$ in which $\forall$ only chooses elements from $\mathfrak{A}_i$. Now let $\mathfrak{B} = \bigcup_{i<\omega} \mathfrak{A}_i$. This is a countable elementary subalgebra of $\mathfrak{D}$, hence necessarily atomic, and $\exists$ has a winning strategy in $G(\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{B})$, so by [22, Theorem 3.3.3], $\mathfrak{B}$ is completely representable; furthermore $\mathfrak{B} \equiv \mathfrak{C}$.

(a) $\exists$ s winning strategy in $G_k(\mathsf{AtPEA}_{\mathbb{Z},\mathbb{N}})$ for each finite k: Let $M_0, M_1, \ldots, M_r$, $r < k$ be the coloured graphs at the start of a play of G_k just before round $r+1$. Assume inductively, that $\exists$ computes a partial function $\rho_s : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{N}$, for $s \leq r$. Here her 'red moves' are further restricted by the newly added forbidden triple, so her strategy is not quite like usual rainbow winning strategy's. Inductively for $s \leq r$:

1. If $M_s(x, y)$ is green then $\forall$ coloured it,
2. $\rho_0 \subseteq \ldots \rho_r \subseteq \ldots$,
3. $\mathsf{dom}(\rho_s) = \{i \in \mathbb{Z} : \exists t \leq s, x, x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_{n-2} \in \mathsf{nodes}(M_s)$ where the x_i's form the base of a cone, x is its appex and i its tint$\}$. The domain consists of the tints of cones created at an earlier stage,
4. ρ_s is order preserving: if $i < j$ then $\rho_s(i) < \rho_s(j)$. The range of ρ_s is widely spaced: if $i < j \in \mathsf{dom}\rho_s$ then $\rho_s(i) - \rho_s(j) \geq 3^{k-r}$, where $k - r$ is the number of rounds remaining in the game,
5. For $u, v, x_0 \in \mathsf{nodes}(M_s)$, if $M_s(u, v) = \mathsf{r}_{\mu,\delta}$, $M_s(x_0, u) = \mathsf{g}^i_0$, $M_s(x_0, v) = \mathsf{g}^j_0$, where i, j are tints of two cones, with base F such that x_0 is the first element in F under the induced linear order, then $\rho_s(i) = \mu$ and $\rho_s(j) = \delta$,
6. M_s is a a coloured graph,
7. If the base of a cone $\Delta \subseteq M_s$ with tint i is coloured y_S, then $i \in S$.

To start with, if $\forall$ plays a in the initial round then $\mathsf{nodes}(M_0) = n$, the hyperedge labelling is defined by $M_0(0, 1, \ldots, n-1) = a$. In response to a cylindrifier move for some $s \leq r$, involving a p cone, $p \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\exists$ must extend ρ_r to ρ_{r+1} so that $p \in \mathsf{dom}(\rho_{r+1})$ and the gap between elements of its range is at least 3^{k-r-1}. Properties (3) and (4) are easily maintained in round $r+1$. Inductively, ρ_r is order preserving and the gap between its elements is at least 3^{k-r}, so this can be maintained in a further round. If $\forall$ chooses a green colour, or green colour whose suffix that already belong to ρ_r, there would be fewer elements to add to the domain of ρ_{r+1}, which makes it easy for $\exists$ to define ρ_{r+1}.

Now assume that at round $r+1$, the current coloured graph is M_r and that $\forall$ chose the graph Φ, $|\Phi| = n$ with distinct nodes $F \cup \{\delta\}$, $\delta \notin M_r$, and $F \subseteq M_r$ has size $n-1$. We can view $\exists$ s move as building a coloured graph M^* extending M_r whose nodes are those of M_r, together with the new node δ, and whose edges are edges of M_r together with edges from δ to every node of F. Now $\exists$ must extend M^* to a complete graph M^+ on the same nodes and complete the colouring giving a coloured graph $M_{r+1} = M^+$. In particular, she has to define $M^+(\beta, \delta)$ for all nodes $\beta \in M_r \sim F$, such that all of the above properties are maintained. She does this as follows:

(1) If β and δ are both apexes of two cones on F. The two cones induce the same linear ordering on F. We have $\beta \notin F$, but it is in M_r, while δ is not in M_r, and $|F| = n - 1$. By the rules of the game $\exists$ has no choice but to pick a red colour. $\exists$ uses her auxiliary function ρ_{r+1} to determine

the suffices, she lets $\mu = \rho_{r+1}(p)$, $b = \rho_{r+1}(q)$ where p and q are the tints of the two cones based on F, whose apexes are β and δ. Then she sets $M^+(\beta, \delta) = \mathsf{r}_{\mu,b}$ maintaining property (5), and so $\delta \in \mathsf{dom}(\rho_{r+1})$ maintaining property (4). We check consistency to maintain property (6).

Consider a triangle of nodes (β, y, δ) in the graph $M_{r+1} = M^+$. For $y \in \mathsf{nodes}(M_r)$, assume that the edges $M^+(y, \beta)$ and $M^+(y, \delta)$ are coloured green with distinct superscripts p, q. This does not contradict forbidden triangles of the form involving $(\mathsf{g}_0^p, \mathsf{g}_0^q, \mathsf{r}_{kl})$, because ρ_{r+1} is constructed to be order preserving. Now assume that $M_{r+1}(\beta, y)$ and $M_{r+1}(y, \delta)$ are both red (some $y \in \mathsf{nodes}(M_r)$). Then $\exists$ chose the red label $M_{r+1}(y, \delta)$, for δ is a new node. We can assume that y is the apex of a cone with base F in M_r. If not then $M_{r+1}(y, \delta)$ would be coloured w by $\exists$ and there will be no problem as shown next. All properties will be maintained. Now $y, \beta \in M_r$, so by by property (5) we have $M_{r+1}(\beta, y) = \mathsf{r}_{\rho+1(p),\rho+1(t)}$. But $\delta \notin M_r$, so by her strategy, we have $M_{r+1}(y, \delta) = \mathsf{r}_{\rho+1(t),\rho+1(q)}$. But $M_{r+1}(\beta, \delta) = \mathsf{r}_{\rho+1(p),\rho+1(q)}$, and we are done. This is consistent triple, and so have shown that forbidden triples of reds are avoided.

(2) If there is no $f \in F$ such that $M^*(\beta, f), M^*(\delta, f)$ are coloured g_0^t, g_0^u for some t, u respectively, then $\exists$ defines $M^+(\beta, \delta)$ to be w_0.

(3) If this is not the case, and for some $0 < i < n-1$ there is no $f \in F$ such that $M^*(\beta, f), M^*(\delta, f)$ are both coloured g_i, she chooses w_i for $M^+(\beta, \delta)$.

It is clear that the choices in the last two items avoid all forbidden triangles (involving greens and whites). She has not chosen green maintaining property (1). For colourings $n-1$ tuples by shades of yellow, this can be done like any (all) of [24, p.16] or [18, p.844] or [22], maintaining property (7).

(b) $\forall$ s winning strategy in F^{n+3}: We show that $\forall$ has a winning strategy in F^{n+3}, the argument used is the CA analogue of [16, Theorem 33, Lemma 41] except that now F^{n+3} is played on coloured graphs. The rough idea is that the added forbidden triple will restrict $\exists$ s choices of reds and it will allow $\forall$ to win the ω rounded game F^{n+3} by pebbling $\mathbb{N}$ and its mirror image $-\mathbb{N} = \{-a : a \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ using and re-using the $n+3$ pebbles on the board, in this way, forcing $\exists$ a decreasing sequence in $\mathbb{N}$, so she loses in ω rounds.

In more detail, in the initial round $\forall$ plays a graph M with nodes $0, 1, \ldots, n-1$ such that $M(i, j) = \mathsf{w}_0$ for $i < j < n-1$ and $M(i, n-1) = \mathsf{g}_i$ $(i = 1, \ldots, n-2)$, $M(0, n-1) = \mathsf{g}_0^0$ and $M(0, 1, \ldots, n-2) = \mathsf{y}_{\mathbb{Z}}$. This is a 0 cone. In the following move $\forall$ chooses the base of the cone $(0, \ldots, n-2)$ and demands a node n with $M_2(i, n) = \mathsf{g}_i$ $(i = 1, \ldots, n-2)$, and $M_2(0, n) = \mathsf{g}_0^{-1}$. $\exists$ must choose a label for the edge $(n+1, n)$ of M_2. It must be a red atom r_{mk}, $m, k \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $-1 < 0$, then by the 'order preserving' condition we have $m < k$. In the next move $\forall$ plays the face $(0, \ldots, n-2)$ and demands a node $n+1$, with $M_3(i, n) = \mathsf{g}_i$ $(i = 1, \ldots, n-2)$, such that $M_3(0, n+2) = \mathsf{g}_0^{-2}$. Then $M_3(n+1, n)$ and $M_3(n+1, n-1)$ both being red, the indices must match. $M_3(n+1, n) = r_{lk}$ and $M_3(n+1, r-1) = r_{km}$ with $l < m \in \mathbb{N}$.

In the next round $\forall$ plays $(0, 1, \ldots n-2)$ and re-uses the node 2 such that $M_4(0, 2) = \mathsf{g}_0^{-3}$. This time we have $M_4(n, n-1) = \mathsf{r}_{jl}$ for some $j < l < m \in \mathbb{N}$. Continuing in this manner leads to a decreasing sequence in $\mathbb{N}$.

We have proved that any L between $\mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega$ and $\mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_3^{\mathsf{ad}}$ is not elementary, and that the same holds, if we replace the former class by CRK_n, since $\mathfrak{B}$ is in $\mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega \cap \mathsf{CRK}_\mathsf{n}$ by theorem 4.2. We also have the Sc reduct of $\mathsf{PEA}_{\mathbb{Z},\mathbb{N}}$ is not in $\mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{Sc}_{n+3}^{\mathsf{ad}}$ by lemma 3.6. By complete additivity of PEAs and CAs, we get that for K having a CA reduct, any class L, such that $\mathsf{CRK}_\mathsf{n} \subseteq$

$\mathsf{L} \subseteq \mathbf{S_c}\mathfrak{Nr}_\mathsf{n}\mathsf{K}_{\mathsf{n+3}}$, is not elementary. CRDf_n is not elementary because $\mathfrak{C}$ is completely generated by the set $\{x \in C : \Delta x \neq n\}$ hence its Df reduct is not completely representable and obviously $\mathfrak{Rd}_{df}\mathfrak{C} \equiv \mathfrak{Rd}_{df}\mathfrak{B}$ and $\mathfrak{Rd}_{df}\mathfrak{B}$ is completely representable.

Assume that $\mathfrak{Rd}_{qa}\mathfrak{C} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D}$ for some $\mathfrak{D} \in \mathsf{QA}_{n+3}$ where only s_0^{1D} is completely additive. Then every substitution operation corresponding to a replacement in $\mathfrak{D}$, can be obtained from a composition of finitely many substitution operations involving only one replacement s_0^1 and all the rest are substitution operations that correspond to transpositions. To prove this, we can assume without loss that $i \neq 0, 1$. Then computing we get:

$$\mathsf{s}_{[1,i]}\mathsf{s}_0^1 x = \mathsf{s}_0^i \mathsf{s}_{[1,i]} x \text{ so } \mathsf{s}_{[1,i]}\mathsf{s}_0^1\mathsf{s}_{[1,i]} x = \mathsf{s}_0^i \mathsf{s}_{[1,i]}\mathsf{s}_{[1,i]} x = \mathsf{s}_0^i x,$$

$$\mathsf{s}_i^0 x = \mathsf{s}_{[0,i]}\mathsf{s}_0^1 x = \mathsf{s}_{[i,0]}\mathsf{s}_{[1,i]}\mathsf{s}_0^1\mathsf{s}_{[i,1]} x \text{ and } \mathsf{s}_{[0,j]}\mathsf{s}_i^0 x = \mathsf{s}_i^j \mathsf{s}_{[0,j]} x.$$

Continuing the computation:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{s}_i^j x &= \mathsf{s}_{[0,j]}\mathsf{s}_{[0,j]}\mathsf{s}_i^j x \\ &= \mathsf{s}_{[0,j]}\mathsf{s}_i^0\mathsf{s}_{[0,j]} x \\ &= \mathsf{s}_{[i,0]}\mathsf{s}_{[1,i]}\mathsf{s}_0^1\mathsf{s}_{[1,i]}\mathsf{s}_{[0,j]} x. \end{aligned}$$

We have shown that:

$$\mathsf{s}_i^j = \mathsf{s}_{[0,j]} \circ \mathsf{s}_{[i,0]} \circ \mathsf{s}_{[1,i]} \circ \mathsf{s}_0^1 \circ \mathsf{s}_{[1,i]} \circ \mathsf{s}_{[0,j]}.$$

All such substitution operations are completely additive, the ones involving transpositions are in fact self–conjugate, hence we get that $\mathfrak{D}$ is completely additive, which is impossible.

(c) More difficult games for $\exists$ and stronger results: We introduce a stronger game played, denoted below by H, played on *hypernetworks* (to be defined next) aspiring a stronger result. This game is the CA analogue of a game devised by Robin Hirsch for relation algebras in [16]. A few non–trivial modifications are needed. Fix $2 < n < \omega$. Let $\mathfrak{C} = \mathsf{PEA}_{\mathbb{Z},\mathbb{N}}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$ be as above. Using a winning strategy for $\exists$ in H_m (H restricted to m rounds $m < \omega$), we further show that $\mathfrak{B}$ can be chosen to satisfy that $(+)$ $\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{B} \in \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{QEA}_\omega$ and $\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{B} \in \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{QEA}_\omega$, and we discuss the possibility of removing At from $(+)$ getting the (stronger) result that $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{QEA}_\omega$, witness theorem 4.12, and remark **??**. In [16], At was removed from an analogous membership relation, namely, for a certain relation algebra R, from $\mathsf{AtR} \in \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{Ra}\mathsf{CA}_\omega$, it was inferred that $\mathsf{R} \in \mathfrak{Ra}\mathsf{CA}_\omega$ [16, Theorem 39, 45]. As mentioned before the proof of this theorem, this is a mistake that was corrected in [17], by weakening the result erraneously proved in [16]. Here we prove a result stronger than the result anounced in [17], but still weaker than the alledged result in [16], which together with its CA analogue, remains open for both RAs and CAs, though for CAs many special cases, like that proved in the second item pf theorem 4.12, are already known. But the main result in [16] in its full generality remains unproved.

For an atomic network and for $x, y \in \mathsf{nodes}(N)$, we set $x \sim y$ if there exists $\bar{z}$ such that $N(x, y, \bar{z}) \leq \mathsf{d}_{01}$. Define the equivalence relation $\sim$ over the set of all finite sequences over $\mathsf{nodes}(N)$ by $\bar{x} \sim \bar{y}$ iff $|\bar{x}| = |\bar{y}|$ and $x_i \sim y_i$ for all $i < |\bar{x}|$. (It can be easily checked that this indeed an equivalence relation).

A *hypernetwork* $N = (N^a, N^h)$ over an atomic polyadic equality algebra consists of a network N^a together with a labelling function for hyperlabels $N^h : {}^{<\omega}\mathsf{nodes}(N) \to \Lambda$ (some arbitrary set of hyperlabels Λ) such that for $\bar{x}, \bar{y} \in {}^{<\omega}\mathsf{nodes}(N)$ if $\bar{x} \sim \bar{y} \Rightarrow N^h(\bar{x}) = N^h(\bar{y})$. If $|\bar{x}| = k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $N^h(\bar{x}) = \lambda$, then we say that λ is a k-ary hyperlabel. $\bar{x}$ is referred to as a k–ary hyperedge, or simply a hyperedge. We may remove the superscripts a and h if no confusion is likely to ensue.

The is a one–to–one correspondence between networks and coloured graphs [22, Second half of pp 76]. If Γ is a coloured graph, then by N_Γ we mean the corresponding network. A hyperedge $\bar{x} \in {}^{<\omega}\mathsf{nodes}(\Gamma)$ of length m is *short*, if there are $y_0, \dots, y_{n-1}$ that are nodes in N_Γ, such that $N_\Gamma(x_i, y_0, \bar{z}) \leq \mathsf{d}_{01}$ or $\dots N_\Gamma(x_i, y_{n-1}, \bar{z}) \leq \mathsf{d}_{01}$ for all $i < |x|$, for some (equivalently for all) $\bar{z}$. Otherwise, it is called *long.* A hypergraph (Γ, l) is called λ–*neat* if $N_\Gamma(\bar{x}) = \lambda$ for all short hyperedges.

Concerning his moves, this game with m rounds, denoted by H_m, $\forall$ can play a cylindrifier move, like before but now played on λ_0—neat hypernetworks. Also $\forall$ can play a *transformation move* by picking a previously played hypernetwork N and a partial, finite surjection $\theta : \omega \to \mathsf{nodes}(N)$, this move is denoted (N, θ). $\exists$'s response is mandatory. She must respond with $N\theta$. Finally, $\forall$ can play an *amalgamation move* by picking previously played hypernetworks M, N such that $M\restriction_{\mathsf{nodes}(M)\cap\mathsf{nodes}(N)} = N\restriction_{\mathsf{nodes}(M)\cap\mathsf{nodes}(N)}$, and $\mathsf{nodes}(M) \cap \mathsf{nodes}(N) \neq \emptyset$. This move is denoted (M, N). To make a legal response, $\exists$ must play a λ_0–neat hypernetwork L extending M and N, where $\mathsf{nodes}(L) = \mathsf{nodes}(M) \cup \mathsf{nodes}(N)$.

It can be shown that $\exists$ has a winning strategy in $H_m(\mathsf{AtPEA}_{\mathbb{Z},\mathbb{N}})$ for each finite m. The analogous proof for relation algebras is rather long [16, p.25-31] so we will be sketchy. We have already dealt with the graph part.

We now have to extend his strategy dealing with λ– neat hypernetworks, where λ is constant label. Labelling hyperedges is exactly like in [16]. In a play, $\exists$ is required to play λ neat hypernetworks, so she has no choice about the hyperedges for short edges, these are labelled by λ. In response to a cylindrifier move by $\forall$ extending the current hypergraph providing a new node k, and a previously played coloured graph M all long hyperedges not incident with k necessarily keep the hyperlabel they had in M. All long hyperedges incident with k in M are given unique hyperlabels not occurring as the hyperlabel of any other hyperedge in M. In response to an amalgamation move, which involves two hypergraphs required to be amalgamated, say (M, N) all long hyperedges whose range is contained in $\mathsf{nodes}(M)$ have hyperlabel determined by M, and those whose range is contained in $\mathsf{nodes}(N)$ have hyperlabels determined by N. If $\bar{x}$ is a long hyperedge of $\exists$ s response L where $\mathsf{rng}(\bar{x}) \not\subseteq \mathsf{nodes}(M), \mathsf{nodes}(N)$ then $\bar{x}$ is given a new hyperlabel, not used in any previously played hypernetwork and not used within L as the label of any hyperedge other than $\bar{x}$. This completes her strategy for labelling hyperedges.

We turn to the remaining amalgamation moves. We need some notation and terminology taken from [16, pp.25]. Every edge of any hypernetwork has an *owner* $\forall$ *or* $\exists$, namely, the one who coloured this edge. We call such edges $\forall$ edges or $\exists$ edges. Each long hyperedge $\bar{x}$ in a hypernetwork N occurring in the play has *an envelope* $v_N(\bar{x})$ to be defined shortly. In the initial round, $\forall$ plays $a \in \alpha$ and $\exists$ plays N_0 then all irreflexive edges of N_0 belongs to $\forall$. There are no long hyperedges in N_0. If in a later move, $\forall$ plays the transformation move (N, θ) and $\exists$ responds with $N\theta$, then owners and envelopes are inherited in the obvious way. If $\forall$ plays a cylindrifier move requiring a new node k and $\exists$ responds with M then the owner in M of an edge not incident with k is the same as it was in N and the envelope in M of a long hyperedge not incident with k is the same as that it was in N.

All edges (l, k) for $l \in \mathsf{nodes}(N) \sim \{k\}$ belong to $\exists$ in M. if $\bar{x}$ is any long hyperedge of M with $k \in \mathsf{rng}(\bar{x})$, then $v_M(\bar{x}) = \mathsf{nodes}(M)$. If $\forall$ plays the amalgamation move (M, N) and $\exists$ responds with L then for $m \neq n \in \mathsf{nodes}(L)$ the owner in L of a edge (m, n) is $\forall$ if it belongs to $\forall$ in either M or N, in all other cases it belongs to $\exists$ in L. If $\bar{x}$ is a long hyperedge of L then $v_L(\bar{x}) = v_M(x)$ if $\mathsf{rng}(x) \subseteq \mathsf{nodes}(M)$, $v_L(x) = v_N(x)$ and $v_L(x) = \mathsf{nodes}(M)$ otherwise. This completes the definition of owners and envelopes. The next claim, basically, reduces amalgamation moves to cylindrifier moves. By induction on the number of rounds one can show:

Claim:

- Let M, N occur in a play of H_m, $0 < m \in \omega$. in which $\exists$ uses the above labelling for hyperedges. Let $\bar{x}$ be a long hyperedge of M and let $\bar{y}$ be a long hyperedge of N. Then for any hyperedge $\bar{x}'$ with $\mathsf{rng}(\bar{x}') \subseteq v_M(\bar{x})$, if $M(\bar{x}') = M(\bar{x})$ then $\bar{x}' = \bar{x}$,
- If $\bar{x}$ is a long hyperedge of M and $\bar{y}$ is a long hyperedge of N, and $M(\bar{x}) = N(\bar{y})$, then there is a local isomorphism $\theta : v_M(\bar{x}) \to v_N(\bar{y})$ such that $\theta(x_i) = y_i$ for all $i < |x|$,
- For any $x \in \mathsf{nodes}(M) \sim v_M(\bar{x})$ and $S \subseteq v_M(\bar{x})$, if (x, s) belong to $\forall$ in M for all $s \in S$, then $|S| \leq 2$.

Next, we proceed inductively with the inductive hypothesis exactly as before, except that now each N_r is a λ neat hypergraph. All other inductive conditions are the same (modulo this replacement). Now, we have already dealt with hyperlabels for long and short hyperedges, we dealt with the graph part of the first hypergraph move. All what remains is the amalgamation move. With the above claim at hand, this turns out an easy task to implement guided by $\exists$ s winning strategy in the graph part.

We consider an amalgamation move (N_s, N_t) chosen by $\forall$ in round $r + 1$. We finish off with edge labelling first. $\exists$ has to choose a colour for each edge (i, j) where $i \in \mathsf{nodes}(N_s) \sim \mathsf{nodes}(N_t)$ and $j \in \mathsf{nodes}(N_t) \sim \mathsf{nodes}(N_s)$.

Let $\bar{x}$ enumerate $\mathsf{nodes}(N_s) \cap \mathsf{nodes}(N_t)$. If $\bar{x}$ is short, then there are at most two nodes in the intersection and this case is similar to the cylindrifier move, she uses ρ_s for the suffixes of the red. If not, that is if $\bar{x}$ is long in N_s, then by the claim there is a partial isomorphism $\theta : v_{N_s}(\bar{x}) \to v_{N_t}(\bar{x})$ fixing $\bar{x}$. We can assume that $v_{N_s}(\bar{x}) = \mathsf{nodes}(N_s) \cap \mathsf{nodes}(N_t) = \mathsf{rng}(\bar{x}) = v_{N_t}(\bar{x})$. It remains to label the edges $(i, j) \in N_{r+1}$ where $i \in \mathsf{nodes}(N_s) \sim \mathsf{nodes}(N_t)$ and $j \in \mathsf{nodes}(N_t) \sim \mathsf{nodes}(N_s)$. Her strategy is similar to the cylindrifier move. If i and j are tints of the same cone she choose a red using ρ_s, If not she chooses a white. She never chooses a green. Then she lets $\rho_{r+1} = \rho_r$ maintaining the inductive hypothesis.

Concerning the last property to be maintained, and that is colouring $n - 1$ types property (7). Let $M^+ = N_s \cup M_s$, which is the graph whose edges are labelled according to the rules of the game, we need to label $n - 1$ hyperedges by shades of yellow. For each tuple $\bar{a} = a_0, \dots a_{n-2} \in {M^+}^{n-1}$, $\bar{a} \notin N_s^{n-1} \cup M_s^{n-1}$, with no edge (a_i, a_j) coloured green (we have already labelled edges), then $\exists$ colours $\bar{a}$ by y_S, where

$$S = \{i \in \mathbb{Z} : \text{ there is an } i \text{ cone in } M^* \text{ with base } \bar{a}\}.$$

We have shown that $\exists$ has a winning strategy in H_m on $\mathsf{AtPEA}_{\mathbb{Z},\mathbb{N}}$ for each finite m. By taking an ultrapower followed by an elementary chain argument (like before), we get that $\exists$ has a winning strategy on $\alpha = \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{B}$ in the ω rounded game H.

By taking an ultrapower followed by an elementary chain argument (like before), we get that $\exists$ has a winning strategy on $\alpha = \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{B}$ in the ω rounded game H.

Fix some $a \in \alpha$. Using $\exists$ s winning strategy in the game of neat hypernetworks, one defines a nested sequence $M_0 \subseteq M_1, \dots$ of neat hypernetworks where M_0 is $\exists$'s response to the initial $\forall$-move a, such that: If M_r is in the sequence and $M_r(\bar{x}) \leq \mathsf{c}_i b$ for an atom b and some $i < n$, then there is $s \geq r$ and $d \in \mathsf{nodes}(N_s)$ such that $M_s(\bar{y}) = b$ such that $\bar{y}_i = d$ and $\bar{y} \equiv_i \bar{x}$. In addition, if M_r is in the sequence and θ is any partial isomorphism of M_r, then there is $s \geq r$ and a partial isomorphism θ^+ of N_s extending θ such that $\mathsf{rng}(\theta^+) \supseteq \mathsf{nodes}(M_r)$.

Now let M_a be the limit of this sequence, that is $M_a = \bigcup M_i$, the labelling of $n-1$ tuples of nodes by atoms, and the hyperedges by hyperlabels done in the obvious way. Let L be the signature with one n-ary relation for each $b \in \alpha = \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{B}$, and one k–ary predicate symbol for each k–ary hyperlabel λ.

We work in $L^n_{\infty,\omega}$. For fixed $f_a \in {}^{\omega}\mathsf{nodes}(M_a)$, let $U_a = \{f \in {}^{\omega}\mathsf{nodes}(M_a) : \{i < \omega : g(i) \neq f_a(i)\} \text{ is finite}\}$. Now we make U_a into the universe an L relativized structure $\mathcal{M}_a$ like in [16, Theorem 29] except that we allow a clause for infinitary disjunctions. In more detail, we have For $b \in \alpha,\ l_0, \dots, l_{n-1}, i_0 \dots, i_{k-1} < \omega,\ \ k$–ary hyperlabels λ, and all L-formulas ϕ, ϕ_i, ψ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}_a, f \models b(x_{l_0} \dots, x_{n-1}) &\iff \mathcal{M}_a(f(l_0), \dots, f(l_{n-1})) = b,\\
\mathcal{M}_a, f \models \lambda(x_{i_0}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}) &\iff \mathcal{M}_a(f(i_0), \dots, f(i_{k-1})) = \lambda,\\
\mathcal{M}_a, f \models \neg\phi &\iff \mathcal{M}_a, f \not\models \phi,\\
\mathcal{M}_a, f \models (\bigvee_{i\in I} \phi_i) &\iff (\exists i \in I)(\mathcal{M}_a, f \models \phi_i),\\
\mathcal{M}_a, f \models \exists x_i \phi &\iff \mathcal{M}_a, f[i/m] \models \phi, \text{ some } m \in \mathsf{nodes}(\mathcal{M}_a).
\end{aligned}$$

We check that the rest of the proof in [16] survives this non–trivial change. We are now working with (weak) set algebras whose semantics is induced by $L_{\infty,\omega}$ formulas in the signature L, instead of first order ones. For any such L-formula ϕ, write $\phi^{\mathcal{M}_a}$ for $\{f \in {}^{\omega}\mathsf{nodes}(M_a) : \mathcal{M}_a, f \models \phi\}$. Let $D_a = \{\phi^{\mathcal{M}_a} : \phi \text{ is an } L\text{-formula}\}$ and $\mathfrak{D}_a$ be the set algebra with universe D_a. Then $\mathfrak{D}_a$ is locally finite, that is, the dimension set of any element in $\mathfrak{D}_a$ is finite, because (the two 'sorts' of) formulas use only finitely many variable. Let $\mathfrak{D} = \mathbf{P}_{a\in\alpha}\mathfrak{D}_a$. However, $\mathfrak{D}$ is a generalized weak set algebra, that might not be locally finite. Exactly as in [16], it can be proved that $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D}$ is atomic and $\alpha \cong \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D}$ — the isomorphism is $b \mapsto (b(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})^{\mathfrak{D}_a} : a \in \alpha)$. We have shown that $\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{B} \in \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{QEA}_\omega$. The last part is a fairly straightforward adaptation of the technique used in [16, Theorem 29], building a representable ω dilation $\mathfrak{D}$ from a 'saturated set' of λ–neat hypernetworks, using games, replacing binary relation symbols with n–ary ones and working in $L_{\infty,\omega}$ instead of $L_{\omega,\omega}$. Now we reap the harvest of our 'infinitary addition'. Because we are working in $L_{\infty,\omega}$, infinite disjuncts exist in $\mathfrak{D}_a$ $(a \in \alpha)$, hence, they exist too in the dilation $\mathfrak{D} = \mathbf{P}_{a\in\alpha}\mathfrak{D}_a$. Therefore $\mathfrak{D}$ is complete. Now by lemma 4.5, we have $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D}_a \subseteq_c \mathfrak{D}_a$ from which we get:

$$\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D} = \mathfrak{Nr}_n(\mathbf{P}_{a\in\alpha}\mathfrak{D}_a) = \mathbf{P}_{a\in\alpha}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D}_a \subseteq_c \mathbf{P}_{a\in\alpha}\mathfrak{D}_a = \mathfrak{D}.$$

Because $\mathfrak{D}$ is complete, and $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{D}$, then $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D}$ is complete. But $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D} \subseteq \mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{B}$ is dense in $\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{B}$, because they share the same atom structure. It readily follows, from the completeness of $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D}$, that $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D} = \mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{B}$, so that $\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{B} \in \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{QEA}_\omega$ as required.

Now the Df reduct of $\mathfrak{C} = \mathsf{PEA}_{\mathbb{Z},\mathbb{N}}$ is also not completely representable, for the set $\{x \in \mathfrak{C} : \Delta c \neq n\}$ completely generates $\mathfrak{C}$, it follows that $\mathfrak{Rd}_{df}\mathfrak{C}$ is also not completely representable [24, Proposition 4.10]. Hence, we readily infer that the class of completely representable Df_ns is not elementary, since obviously $\mathfrak{Rd}_{df}\mathfrak{C} \equiv \mathfrak{Rd}_{df}\mathfrak{B}$ and the latter is CRDf_n.

Proof of (2): The atomic algebra $\mathfrak{Rd}_{\mathsf{K}}\mathfrak{B}$ given in the first item of theorem 4.12 is outside $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_{n+1} \supseteq \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega$, but $\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{B} \in \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega$, hence $\mathfrak{Rd}_{\mathsf{K}}\mathfrak{B} \in \mathbf{N}$ and is outside $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega$.

We have $\mathfrak{Rd}_{\mathsf{K}}\mathsf{PEA}_{\mathbb{Z},\mathbb{N}} = \mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{Rd}_{\mathsf{K}}\mathsf{PEA}_{\mathbb{Z},\mathbb{N}} \notin \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}^{\mathsf{ad}}_\omega = \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega$, *a fortiori* it is not in $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega$. But in the proof of the first item of theorem 5.1, we have shown that there is a countable completely representable $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathsf{PEA}_n$ such that $\mathfrak{B} \equiv \mathsf{PEA}_{\mathbb{Z},\mathbb{N}}$ and $\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{B} \in \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{QEA}_\omega \cap \mathsf{CRQEA}_n$, so $\mathbf{N}$ is not elementary.

If $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathbf{N}$, then $\mathfrak{Cm}\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A} \in \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega \subseteq \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}^{\mathsf{ad}}_\omega$, the last is gripped, hence $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega$. If $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathbb{N} \cap \mathsf{Count}$, then $\mathfrak{Cm}\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A} \in \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega$ has countably many atoms, hence by the first item of theorem 4.2, $\mathfrak{Cm}\mathsf{At} \in \mathsf{CRK}_n$; the latter is gripped, hence $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{CRK}_n$. The strictness of the two inclusions as in the statement of this item is witnessed by $\mathsf{PEA}_{\mathbb{Z},\mathbb{N}}$.

Proof of (2). Idea of Proof: We deal only with CAs in this sketch of the idea of proof. The rainbow algebra based on A (the greens) and B (the reds) is denoted by $\mathsf{CA}_{A,B}$. Fix $2 < n < \omega$. The gist of the idea makes use of the model–theoretic techniques of Hodkinson's used in [24] conjuncted with a blow up and blur construction in the sense of [8].

In [24], Hodkinson proves that RCA_n $(2 < n < \omega)$ is not atom–canonical. Hodkinson's proof is semantical; ours is syntactical implemented by blowing up and blurring a finite rainbow polyadic-equality algebra, in which 'the number' of greens is $n + 1$ and the reds n.

The blow up and blur addition, will allow us to refine and indeed strengthen Hodkinson's result, showing that for any class K, such that $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_{n+3} \subseteq \mathsf{K} \subseteq \mathsf{RCA}_n$, K is not atom–canonical. This applies to the infinitely many varieties $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_{n+k}$, $k \geq 3$ [23].

Here the dimension $d = n + 3$, which is the least d for which we could prove that $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_{n+d}$ is not atom–canonical, is determined by the number of greens, which we denote by $\mathsf{num}(\mathsf{g})$ used in our rainbow construction; $\mathsf{num}(\mathsf{g}) = n+1$. We have $n+3 = \mathsf{num}(\mathsf{g})+2$, where 2 is the increase occurring in the number of nodes (pebbles) resulting from lifting the winning strategy of $\forall$ in the Ehrenfeucht–Fraïssé forth private game between $\forall$ and $\exists$ on the complete irreflexive graphs $n + 1$ and n, to the number of nodes used by $\forall$ in the graph game on the rainbow algebra $\mathsf{CA}_{n+1,n}$.

Blowing up and blurring $\mathsf{CA}_{n+1,n}$, by splitting the 'red atoms' each into ω many, will give a representable algebra $\mathfrak{A}$ similar to the term algebra used by Hodkinson; in fact the only difference is that we use only $n + 1$ greens not infinitely many. As long as their number outfits the reds, $\forall$ can win in a finite rounded game. The Dedekind–MacNeille completion of At, call it $\mathfrak{C}$, will be outside $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_{n+3}$, because $\mathsf{CA}_{n+1,n}$ is outside $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_{n+3}$ by the fact that $\forall$ has a winning strategy in G^{n+3} using only $n + 3$ nodes *without* the need to reuse them, witness lemma 3.6 and $\mathsf{CA}_{n+1,n}$ embeds into $\mathfrak{C}$. So although $\mathfrak{A}$ is (ω–square) representable, by the first item of lemma 3.6, its Dedekind–MacNeille completion $\mathfrak{C}$ does not even have an $n + 3$–flat representation.

The proof is divided into two parts:

- In the first part we 'blow up and blur' a finite rainbow algebra $\mathfrak{D}$ (denoted in the proof below by $\mathsf{PEA}_{n+1,n}$) by splitting some of the atoms (the red ones), each into infinitely many, getting a weakly representable atom structure At, and we embed $\mathfrak{D}$ into the complex algebra $\mathfrak{Cm}\mathsf{At}$, the Dedekind–MacNeille completion of $\mathfrak{Tm}\mathsf{At}$.

- In the second part, we show that $\forall$ has a winning strategy in $G^{n+3}(\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{D})$, hence using lemma 3.6, we get that $\mathfrak{Rd}_{sc}\mathfrak{D} \notin \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{Sc}_{n+3}$. Here, unlike the first item, additivity does not interfere because $\mathfrak{D}$ is finite.

(a) Blowing up and blurring a finite rainbow algebra: Take the finite rainbow algebra where the reds R is the complete irreflexive graph n, and the greens are $\mathsf{G} = \{\mathsf{g}_i : 1 \leq i < n-1\} \cup \{\mathsf{g}^i_0 : 1 \leq i \leq n+1\}$, but endowed with the polyadic operations. Call this finite rainbow PEA_n, $\mathsf{PEA}_{n+1,n}$ and denote its atom structure by At_f. One then splits the red atoms of the finite rainbow algebra of $\mathsf{PEA}_{n+1,n}$ each into infinitely many, getting a weakly representable atom structure At, that is the term algebra $\mathfrak{Tm}\mathsf{At}$ is representable.

The resulting atom structure (after splitting), call it At, is the rainbow atom structure that is like the atom structure of the weakly representable algebra $\mathfrak{A}$ constructed in [24], the only difference is that we have $n + 1$ greens and not infinitely many as is the case in [24].

The rainbow signature [22, definition 3.6.9] L now consists of $\mathsf{g}_i : 1 \leq i < n-1$, $\mathsf{g}_0^i : 1 \leq i \leq n+1$, $\mathsf{w}_i : i < n-1$, $\mathsf{r}_{kl}^t : k < l < n$, $t \in \omega$, binary relations, and $n-1$ ary relations y_S, $S \subseteq n+1$.

There is a shade of red ρ; the latter is a binary relation that is outside the rainbow signature, but it labels coloured graphs during a 'rainbow game'. $\exists$ can win the rainbow ω rounded game and build an n–homogeneous model M by using ρ when she is forced a red; [24, Proposition 2.6, Lemma 2.7]. In essence ρ can be identified with the non–principal ultrafilter consisting of all cofinite sets of red graphs, that is graphs that has at least one red rainbow label, of $\mathfrak{Tm}\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$ that is used as a colour to completely represent the canonical extension of $\mathfrak{Tm}\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$. $\mathfrak{Tm}\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$ itself is not, and cannot be, completely representable.

To build M, the class of coloured graphs is considered in the signature $L \cup \{\rho\}$ with the two additional forbidden triples (r, ρ, ρ) and $(\mathsf{r}, \mathsf{r}^*, \rho)$, where r, r^* are any reds, but in forming $\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$ later on, ρ is 'deleted'. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be the class of all models of this *extended rainbow first order theory.* The extra shade of red ρ will be used as a label.

The construction of M is done in a step–by–step way, which can be implemented via an ω–rounded game between $\forall$ and $\exists$. The required M, in the expanded signature, will be the countable limit of the play. In this game $\exists$ uses a rainbow strategy in her choice of labels, but playing ρ whenever forced a red label. The required $M \in \mathcal{G}$ is formed exactly as in [24].

Now deleting the one available red shade, set $W = \{\bar{a} \in {}^nM : M \models (\bigwedge_{i<j<n} \neg\rho(x_i, x_j))(\bar{a})\}$, and for $\phi \in L^n_{\infty,\omega}$, let $\phi^W = \{s \in W : M \models \phi[s]\}$. Here W is the set of all n–ary assignments in ${}^nM$, that have no edge labelled by ρ. Let $\mathfrak{A}$ be the relativized set algebra with domain $\{\varphi^W : \varphi \text{ a first-order } L_n - \text{formula}\}$ and unit W, endowed with the usual concrete operations.

Classical semantics for L_n rainbow formulas and their semantics by relativizing to W coincide [24, Proposition 3.13]. This depends essentially on [24, Lemma 3.10] which says that any permutation χ of $\omega \cup \{\rho\}$, Θ^χ as defined in [24, Definitions 3.9, 3.10] is an n back–and–forth system.

Hence $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathbf{IPes}_n$, that is, $\mathfrak{A}$ is isomorphic to a set algebra of dimension n, so $\mathfrak{A}$ is simple, in fact its Df reduct is simple. From now we forget about ρ; it will play no further role. We have $\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A} = \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{Tm}$, and $\mathfrak{Tm}\mathsf{At} \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$, hence $\mathfrak{Tm}\mathsf{At}$ is representable. The atoms of both are the coloured graphs whose edges are not labelled by ρ. These atoms are uniquely determined by MCA formulas in the rainbow signature of At as in [24, Definition 4.3].

Let $\mathfrak{D} = \{\phi^W : \phi \in L^n_{\infty,\omega}\}$ [24, Definition 4.1] with the operations defined like on $\mathfrak{A}$ the usual way. $\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}$ is complete and, so like in [24, Lemma 5.3] we have an isomorphism from $\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}$ to $\mathfrak{D}$ defined via $\Psi : X \mapsto \bigcup X$.

Now we embed $\mathsf{PEA}_{n+1,n}$ into $\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}$. Roughly one takes every coloured graph Γ which is an atom in $\mathsf{PEA}_{n+1,n}$ to $\bigcup \phi'^M \in \mathfrak{D} \cong \mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}$ where ϕ' is a *copy* of Γ. We explain what we mean by a copy. For brevity, we write r for both r_{jk} and r^l_{jk} $(j < k < n, l \in \omega)$; the superscripts and double indices will be clear from context.

We regard the rainbow signature of $\mathsf{PEA}_{n+1,n}$ as a sub-signature of the rainbow signature of $\mathfrak{A}$, by identifying any red binary relation r in the former signature with r^0 in the latter. (Here ρ does not exist). The non–red rainbow symbols are the same in both signatures. We write M_a for the element of At_f or At for which $a : n \to M$ is a surjection; M a coloured graph in the signature of $\mathfrak{A}$. Then $M_b \in \mathsf{At}$ is a copy of $M_a \in \mathsf{At}_f$ iff

- $a(i) = a(j) \iff b(i) = b(j)$,
- $M_a(a(i), a(j)) = \mathsf{r} \iff M_b(b(i), b(j)) = \mathsf{r}^l, l \in \omega$,
- $M_a(a(i), a(j)) = M_b(b(i), b(j))$, if they are not red,

- $M_a(a(k_0),\dots,a(k_{n-2}))=M_b(b(k_0),\dots,b(k_{n-2}))$, whenever defined.

Now the map $\Theta:\mathsf{At}_f\to\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}$ defined by:

$$\Theta(\{M_a\})=\{M_b:\ M_b \text{ is a copy of } M_a\}$$

induces an embedding from $\mathsf{PEA}_{n+1,n}$ into $\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}$.

Consider now the map η defined from $\mathsf{At}_f\to\mathfrak{D}$ via $\{M_a\}\mapsto\bigcup\phi'^M$, $a:n\to M$ where $M\in\mathsf{CRG}_f(\subseteq\mathsf{CRG})$ and ϕ' the MCA formula obtained from $M\in\mathsf{CGR}$, by replacing a red edge r_{jk}, if any, by any red relation symbol r^l_{jk}, $j<k<n$, and $l\in\omega$, respecting consistent red triangles. Then η is the same embedding just defined from $\mathsf{At}_f\to\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}$, modulo the isomorphism Ψ defined above between $\mathfrak{D}$ and $\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}$, in the sense that $\eta=\Theta\circ\Psi^{-1}$.

(b) $\forall$ s winning strategy in F^{n+3} on $\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{Nr}_{sc}\mathsf{PEA}_{n+1,n}$: We start by showing that $\forall$ has winning strategy first in an Ehrenfeucht–Fraïssé forth private game played between $\exists$ and $\forall$ on the complete irreflexive graphs $n+1$ and n. In each round $0,1\dots n+1$, $\exists$ places a new pebble on element of $n+1$. The edges relation in $n+1$ is irreflexive so to avoid losing $\exists$ must respond by placing the other pebble of the pair on an unused element of $n+1$. After $n+1$ rounds there will be no such element, and she loses in the next round.

This game lifts to a graph game [18, pp.841] on At_f which in this case is equivalent to the graph version of F^{n+3} but unlike the situation in item (2), here $\forall$ does not need to re-use pebbles, so that the game is actually G^{n+3}. We show that $\forall$ can win the graph game on At_f using the standard rainbow strategy [18]. He bombards $\exists$ with cones have the same base and green tints, forcing $\forall$ to play an inconsistent triple of reds whose indices do not match.

In his zeroth move, $\forall$ plays a graph Γ with nodes $0,1,\dots,n-1$ and such that $\Gamma(i,j)=\mathsf{w}_0(i<j<n-1),\Gamma(i,n-1)=\mathsf{g}_i(i=1,\dots,n-2),\Gamma(0,n-1)=\mathsf{g}^0_0$, and $\Gamma(0,1,\dots,n-2)=\mathsf{y}_{n+1}$. This is a 0-cone with base $\{0,\dots,n-2\}$. In the following moves, $\forall$ repeatedly chooses the face $(0,1,\dots,n-2)$ and demands a node α with $\Phi(i,\alpha)=\mathsf{g}_i$, $(i=1,\dots,n-2)$ and $\Phi(0,\alpha)=\mathsf{g}^\alpha_0$, in the graph notation – i.e., an α-cone, $\alpha\leq n+2$, on the same base. $\exists$ among other things, has to colour all the edges connecting new nodes created by $\forall$ as apexes of cones based on the face $(0,1,\dots,n-2)$. By the rules of the game the only permissible colours would be red. Using this, $\forall$ can force a win, using $n+3$ nodes.

Thus by lemma 3.6, $\mathfrak{Nr}_{sc}\mathsf{PEA}_{n+1,n}\notin\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{Sc}_{n+3}$. Since $\mathsf{PEA}_{n+1,n}$ embeds into $\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$, hence $\mathfrak{Nr}_{sc}\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}=\mathfrak{C}m\mathfrak{Nr}_{sc}\mathsf{At}$ is outside $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{Sc}_{n+3}$, too. By lemma 3.6, $\mathfrak{A}$ hence $\mathfrak{C}$, are outside $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{G}_{n+3}$. Note that the diagonal free reduct of $\mathfrak{A}$ has no complete representation, too [25, Proposition 4.10].

This idea of embedding a rainbow algebra in the Dedekind–MacNeille completion of a representable term algebra obtained by blowing up and blurring the rainbow algebra, *also works* in the case of Hodkinson's construction by *blowing up and blurring the non–representable infinite rainbow cylindric algebra* $\mathsf{CA}_{\omega,n}$ which has greens $\mathsf{g}^i_0:i<\omega$ and reds r_{kl}, $k<l<n$ by splitting the reds like we did, thereby obtaining the term algebra $\mathfrak{Tm}\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}\subseteq\mathfrak{A}$ used in [24]. The algebra $\mathsf{CA}_{\omega,n}$ is embeddable in $\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$, with $\mathfrak{A}$ as defined in [24] (with infinitely many greens), so we readily conclude that $\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$ is not representable.

In fact, for any $2<n<k$, such that $n+1\leq k\leq\omega$, blowing up and bluring the rainbow algebra $\mathsf{CA}_{k,n}$, by splitting the red atoms with double distinct indices coming from n, as we did, gives, a representable term algebra $\mathfrak{A}$, call it $\mathsf{Split}(\mathsf{CA}_{k,n},\mathsf{r},\omega)$, short for splitting each red $\mathsf{r}=\mathsf{r}_{ij}$ $(i<j<n)$ in $\mathsf{CA}_{k,n}$ into ω many copies. The Dedekind–MacNeille completion $\mathfrak{C}_k=\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}[\mathsf{Split}(\mathsf{CA}_{k,n},\mathsf{r},\omega)]$ is

outside $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_{2+k}$, hence by theorem 3.5, $\mathfrak{C}_k$ does not have an $2+k$–flat representation. When k is infinite, then by $2+k$ we mean ordinal addition, so that $2+k=k$.

Hodkinson's proof in *op.cit* is different. He proves that a certain tuple in the representation, assuming a representation exists, of $\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}[\mathsf{Split}(\mathsf{CA}_{\omega,n},\mathsf{r},\omega)]$ cf., [24, Lemma 5.7] will be the base of infinitely many cones, that will be used to force an inconsistent triple of reds, concluding that it is not representable.

Conversely, Hodkinson's semantical argument works here, too. Assuming the existence of only *an* $2+k$*–flat representation of* $\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}[\mathsf{Split}(\mathsf{CA}_{k,n},\mathsf{r},\omega))$ it can be proved that a certain tuple in this relativized representation will be the base of $2+k$ many cones, forcing an inconsistent triple of reds. (In such an argument a simple combinatorial application of the Pigeon hole principle is used.) Using the completeness theorem ' $\mathfrak{A}$ has an m–dilations $\iff$ $\mathfrak{A}$ has an m–flat repesentation' the two approaches (proofs) are two sides of the same coin.

Proof of (3): The proof is divided into two parts. In the first we deal with (non–finite) axiomatizability. And in the second we deal with atom–canonicity for infinite dimensional algebras.

(a) Non–finite axiomatizability: At the start we need to recall a piece of notation from [15]. Let $m\leq n$ be ordinals and let $\rho:m\to n$ be an injection. For any n–dimensional algebra $\mathfrak{B}$ (substitution, cylindric or quasi–polyadic algebra with or without equality) we define an m-dimensional algebra $\mathfrak{Rd}^{\rho}\mathfrak{B}$, with the same universe and Boolean structure as $\mathfrak{B}$, where the (ij)th diagonal of $\mathfrak{Rd}^{\rho}\mathfrak{B}$ is $\mathsf{d}_{\rho(i)\rho(j)}\in\mathfrak{B}$ (if diagonals are included in the signature of the algebra), the ith cylindrifier is $\mathsf{c}_{\rho(i)}$, the i for j replacement operator is the operator $\mathsf{s}^{\rho(i)}_{\rho(j)}$ of $\mathfrak{A}$, the ij transposition operator is $\mathsf{s}_{\rho(i)\rho(j)}$ (if included in the signature), for $i,j<m$. It is easy to check, for $\mathsf{K}\in\{\mathsf{Df},\mathsf{Sc},\mathsf{CA},\mathsf{QA},\mathsf{QEA}\}$, that if $\mathfrak{B}\in\mathsf{K}_n$ then $\mathfrak{Rd}^{\rho}\mathfrak{B}\in\mathsf{K}_m$. Also, for $\mathfrak{B}\in\mathsf{K}_n$ and $x\in\mathfrak{B}$, we define $\mathfrak{Rl}_x\mathfrak{B}$ by 'restriction to x', so the universe is the set of elements of $\mathfrak{B}$ below x, where the Boolean unit is x, Boolean zero and sum are not changed, Boolean complementation is relative to x, and the result of applying any non-Boolean operator is obtained by using the operator for $\mathfrak{B}$ and intersecting with x. It is not always the case that $\mathfrak{Rl}_x\mathfrak{B}$ is a K_n (we can lose commutativity of cylindrifiers). However, if x is *rectangular*, in the sense that all $i<j<n$, $\mathsf{c}_ix\cdot\mathsf{c}_jx=x$, then $\mathfrak{Rl}_x\mathfrak{B}\in\mathsf{K}_n$. This is used below.

The idea used here is the same idea used in [23]; both are instances of Monk's trick. But here the result that we lift for finite dimensions is stronger than that obtained for finite dimensions in [23], hence our result obtained for infinite dimensions is stronger than that obtained in [23] when restricted to any K between CA and QEA.

Let $\mathfrak{C}(m,n,r)=\mathfrak{C}a(H^{n+1}_m(\mathfrak{A}(n,r),\omega))$, consisting of all $n+1$–wide m–dimensional wide ω hypernetworks [19, Definition 12.21] on $\mathfrak{A}(n,r)$ as defined in [19, Definition 15.2], is a CA_m, and it can be easily expanded to a PEA_m, since $\mathfrak{C}(m,n,r)$ is symmetric; it allows natural polyadic operations corresponding to transpositions.

Furthermore, for any $r\in\omega$ and $3\leq m\leq n<\omega$, $\mathfrak{C}(m,n,r)\in\mathfrak{Nr}_m\mathsf{PEA}_n$, $\mathfrak{Rd}_{ca}\mathfrak{C}(m,n,r)\notin\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_m\mathsf{CA}_{n+1}$ and $\Pi_{r/U}\mathfrak{C}(m,n,r)\in\mathsf{RPEA}_m$ by easily adapting [19, Corollaries 15.7, 5.10, Exercise 2, pp. 484, Remark 15.13] to the PEA context.

Let $3\leq m<n$. Take

$$x_n=\{f\in H^{n+k+1}_n(\mathfrak{A}(n,r),\omega);m\leq j<n\to\exists i<m,f(i,j)=\mathsf{Id}\}.$$

Then $x_n\in\mathfrak{C}(n,n+k,r)$ and $\mathsf{c}_ix_n\cdot\mathsf{c}_jx_n=x_n$ for distinct $i,j<m$. Furthermore (*), I_n :

$\mathfrak{C}(m,m+k,r) \cong \mathfrak{Rl}_{x_n}\mathfrak{Rd}_m\mathfrak{C}(n,n+k,r)$ via the map, defined for $S \subseteq H_m^{m+k+1}(\mathfrak{A}(m+k,r),\omega))$, by

$$I_n(S) = \{f \in H_n^{n+k+1}(\mathfrak{A}(n,r),\omega) : f \restriction^{\leq m+k+1} m \in S,$$

$$\forall j(m \leq j < n \to \exists i < m, f(i,j) = \mathsf{Id})\}.$$

We have proved the (known) result for finite ordinals > 2. To lift the result to the transfinite, we proceed like in [23], using Monk's trick.

Let $I = \{\Gamma : \Gamma \subseteq \alpha, |\Gamma| < \omega\}$. For each $\Gamma \in I$, let $M_\Gamma = \{\Delta \in I : \Gamma \subseteq \Delta\}$, and let F be an ultrafilter on I such that $\forall \Gamma \in I,\ M_\Gamma \in F$. For each $\Gamma \in I$, let ρ_Γ be an injective function from $|\Gamma|$ onto Γ.

Let $\mathfrak{C}_\Gamma^r$ be an algebra similar to QEA_α such that $\mathfrak{Rd}^{\rho_\Gamma}\mathfrak{C}_\Gamma^r = \mathfrak{C}(|\Gamma|, |\Gamma|+k, r)$ and let $\mathfrak{B}^r = \Pi_{\Gamma/F\in I}\mathfrak{C}_\Gamma^r$. Then we have $\mathfrak{B}^r \in \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathsf{QEA}_{\alpha+k}$ and $\mathfrak{Rd}_{ca}\mathfrak{B}^r \notin \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathsf{CA}_{\alpha+k+1}$. These can be proved exactly like the proof of the first two items in [23, Theorem 3.1]. The second part uses (*).

We know from the finite dimensional case that $\Pi_{r/U}\mathfrak{Rd}^{\rho_\Gamma}\mathfrak{C}_\Gamma^r = \Pi_{r/U}\mathfrak{C}(|\Gamma|, |\Gamma|+k, r) \subseteq \mathfrak{Nr}_{|\Gamma|}\mathfrak{A}_\Gamma$, for some $\mathfrak{A}_\Gamma \in \mathsf{QEA}_{|\Gamma|+\omega} = \mathsf{QEA}_\omega$. Let $\lambda_\Gamma : \omega \to \alpha+\omega$ extend $\rho_\Gamma : |\Gamma| \to \Gamma$ $(\subseteq \alpha)$ and satisfy $\lambda_\Gamma(|\Gamma|+i) = \alpha+i$ for $i < \omega$. Let $\mathfrak{F}_\Gamma$ be a $\mathsf{QEA}_{\alpha+\omega}$ type algebra such that $\mathfrak{Rd}^{\lambda_\Gamma}\mathfrak{F}_\Gamma = \mathfrak{A}_\Gamma$. Then $\Pi_{\Gamma/F}\mathfrak{F}_\Gamma \in \mathsf{QEA}_{\alpha+\omega}$, and we have proceeding like in the proof of item 3 in [23, Theorem 3.1]:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_{r/U}\mathfrak{B}^r &= \Pi_{r/U}\Pi_{\Gamma/F}\mathfrak{C}_\Gamma^r \\
&\cong \Pi_{\Gamma/F}\Pi_{r/U}\mathfrak{C}_\Gamma^r \\
&\subseteq \Pi_{\Gamma/F}\mathfrak{Nr}_{|\Gamma|}\mathfrak{A}_\Gamma \\
&= \Pi_{\Gamma/F}\mathfrak{Nr}_{|\Gamma|}\mathfrak{Rd}^{\lambda_\Gamma}\mathfrak{F}_\Gamma \\
&= \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\Pi_{\Gamma/F}\mathfrak{F}_\Gamma.
\end{aligned}$$

But $\mathfrak{B} = \Pi_{r/U}\mathfrak{B}^r \in \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathsf{QEA}_{\alpha+\omega}$ because $\mathfrak{F} = \Pi_{\Gamma/F}\mathfrak{F}_\Gamma \in \mathsf{QEA}_{\alpha+\omega}$ and $\mathfrak{B} \subseteq \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathfrak{F}$, hence it is representable (here we use the neat embeding theorem). Now it can be easily shown that that $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathsf{CA}_{\alpha+k+l}$ is not axiomatizable by a finite schema over $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathsf{CA}_{\alpha+k}$ in the sense of [15, Definition 5.4.12] for any $l \geq 1$.

In [23, Theorem 3.1], the ultraproduct was proved to be in $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathsf{K}_{\alpha+k+1}$ for K between Sc and QEA, a strict superset of RK_α. In fact, the result here is 'infinitely stronger'. Using a Lós argument, we have RK_α cannot be axiomatized by a finite schema over $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathsf{K}_{\alpha+m}$ for any finite $m \geq 0$, and for any K between CA and QEA.

Before atom–canonicity we prove the last part, since we make use of the above algebras. Fix $2 < n < m < \omega$. Note that from our above arguments, it follows directly that RPEA_n is not finitely axiomatizable over $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{PEA}_m$.

Now write $\mathfrak{C}_r$ for the m–dimensional polyadic equality $\mathfrak{C}(m,n,r)$ not to clutter notation. The parameters m and n will be clear from context. Given k, then for any $r \geq k^2$, we have $\exists$ has a winning strategy in G^k on $\mathfrak{A}(n,r)$ [19, Remark 15.13]. This implies using ultraproducts and an elementary chain argument that $\exists$ has a winning strategy in the ω–rounded game, in an elementary substructure of $\Pi_{r/U}\mathfrak{A}(n,r)/F$, hence the former is representable, and then so is the latter because RRA is a variety. To show that $\Pi_{r/U}\mathfrak{C}^r/F$ is also representable, it suffices to note that there is a representation of an algebra $\mathfrak{A} \prec \Pi_{r/U}\mathfrak{A}(n,r)/F$ that embeds *all* m dimensional hypernetworks, respecting $\equiv_i$ for all $i < m$ [19, Exercise 2, p.484].

Now $\exists$ has a winning strategy in $G_\omega^k(\mathfrak{A}(n,r))$ when $r \geq k^2$, hence, $\mathfrak{A}(n,r)$ embeds into a complete atomic relation algebra having a k–dimensional relational basis by [19, Theorem 12.25]. But this induces a winning strategy for $\exists$ on $\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{C}_r$ in $k' \geq k$, $k' \in \omega$, rounds in the basis cylindric atomic game $G_\omega^{k'}(\mathfrak{C}_r)$ (with k' nodes and ω rounds, defined in the second part of the proof of

lemma 3.6) so that $\mathfrak{C}_r \in \mathbf{L}_{\mathsf{m},\mathsf{k}'}$ when $r \geq k'^2$. So if $n \geq m+2$, $k \geq 3$, and $r \geq k'^2$, then we have $\mathfrak{C}_r \in (\mathbf{L}_{m,n+1} \cap \mathbf{SNr}_m\mathsf{PEA}_n) \sim \mathbf{SNr}_m\mathsf{PEA}_{n+1}$, and $\Pi_{r/U}\mathfrak{C}_r/F \in \mathsf{RPEA}_{\mathsf{m}} \supseteq \mathbf{SNr}_{\mathsf{m}}\mathsf{PEA}_{\mathsf{n}+1}$, and we are done.

(b) Atom canonicity: For non atom–canonicity for infinite dimensions, we use Monk's trick again, lifting the construction in item (2) to the transfinite. To simplify matters, without losing the gist of the idea, we take α to be the least infinite ordinal ω, and we restrict our attention to cylindric algebras. The idea for both uncountable ordinals and other algebras is essentially the same (using ultraproducts as in item (4) above). For each finite $n \geq 3$, let $\mathfrak{A}_n$ be an atomic countable simple representable algebra such that $\mathfrak{B}_n = \mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}_n \notin \mathbf{SNr}_n\mathsf{CA}_{n+3}$. We know by item (3) that such algebras exist.

Let $\mathfrak{A}_n^+$ be an algebra having the signature of CA_ω such that $\mathfrak{Rd}_n\mathfrak{A}_n^+ = \mathfrak{A}_n$. Analogously, let $\mathfrak{B}_n^+$ be an algebra having the signature of CA_ω such that $\mathfrak{Rd}_n\mathfrak{B}_n^+ = \mathfrak{B}_n$, and we require in addition that $\mathfrak{B}_n^+ = \mathfrak{C}m(\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}_n^+)$. Let $\mathfrak{B} = \Pi_{i\in\omega}\mathfrak{B}_i^+/F$. As before we have $\mathfrak{A} = \Pi_{i\in\omega}\mathfrak{A}_i^+/F \in \mathsf{RCA}_\omega$. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A} &= \mathfrak{C}m(\mathsf{At}[\Pi_{i\in\omega}\mathfrak{A}_n^+/F]) \\
&= \mathfrak{C}m[\Pi_{i\in\omega}(\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}_n^+)/F)] \\
&= \Pi_{i\in\omega}(\mathfrak{C}m(\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}_n^+)/F) \\
&= \Pi_{i\in\omega}\mathfrak{B}_n^+/F \\
&= \mathfrak{B}.
\end{aligned}$$

We also have $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathsf{CA}_\omega$. We now show that $\mathfrak{B}$ is outside $\mathbf{SNr}_\omega\mathsf{CA}_{\omega+3}$. Assume for contradiction that $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathbf{SNr}_\omega\mathsf{CA}_{\omega+3}$. Then $\mathfrak{B} \subseteq \mathfrak{Nr}_\omega\mathfrak{C}$ for some $\mathfrak{C} \in \mathsf{CA}_{\omega+3}$. Let $3 \leq m < \omega$ and $\lambda : m+3 \to \omega+3$ be the function defined by $\lambda(i) = i$ for $i < m$ and $\lambda(m+i) = \omega + i$ for $i < 3$.

Then $\mathfrak{Rd}^\lambda\mathfrak{C} \in \mathsf{CA}_{m+3}$ and $\mathfrak{Rd}_m\mathfrak{B} \subseteq \mathfrak{Rd}_m\mathfrak{Rd}^\lambda\mathfrak{C}$. Suppose for the time being that $\mathfrak{B}_m$ embeds into $\mathfrak{Rd}_m\mathfrak{B}_t$, whenever $3 \leq m < t < \omega$, via $I_t : \mathfrak{B}_m \to \mathfrak{Rd}_m\mathfrak{B}_t$. Let $\iota(b) = (I_t b : t \geq m)/F$ for $b \in \mathfrak{B}_m$. Then ι is an injective homomorphism that embeds $\mathfrak{B}_m$ into $\mathfrak{Rd}_m\mathfrak{B}$. By the above we have $\mathfrak{Rd}_m\mathfrak{B} \in \mathbf{SNr}_m\mathsf{CA}_{m+3}$, hence $\mathfrak{B}_m \in \mathbf{SNr}_m\mathsf{CA}_{m+3}$, too which is a contradiction, and we will be done.

Now we prove our assumption finishing the proof. Let t_1 be the rainbow signature of $\mathfrak{B}_m$ and t_2 be the rainbow signature of $\mathfrak{B}_t$; then identifying algebras with their universes, we have, modulo isomorphisms (witness item (2)), $\mathfrak{B}_m = \{\phi^{W_1} : \phi \in L^m_{\infty,\omega}\}$ and $\mathfrak{B}_t = \{\phi^{W_2} : \phi \in L^t_{\infty,\omega}\}$ where $W_1 = \{\bar{a} \in {}^mM : M \models (\bigwedge_{i<j<n, l<n} \neg\rho(x_i, x_j))(\bar{a})\}$, and W_2 is defined analogously by replacing m by t. We can assume without loss that $t = m+1$, then we proceed inductively.

Fix m as above. Let $\eta : m-1 \to m$ be an injection. Define $\eta^+ : m \to m+1$ by $\eta^+ \restriction m-1 = \eta$ and $\eta^+(m-1)$ is the unique $a \in m \sim \mathsf{rng}(\eta)$. Then $\eta^+ : m \to m+1$ is an injection such that $m \notin \mathsf{rng}(\eta^+)$. Conversely, let $\eta : m \to m+1$ be such that $m \notin \mathsf{rng}(\eta)$. Let $\eta_+ = \eta \restriction m-1$, Then $\eta_+ : m-1 \to m$ is an injection. Also $(\eta_+)^+ = \eta$.

Now let $In(A, B)$ denote the set of all injective functions from A to B. Using the correspondence established in the last paragraph, one maps coloured graphs corresponding to MCA formulas in the signature t_1, that is, atoms in $\mathfrak{B}_m$ to coloured graphs corresponding to MCA formulas in $\mathfrak{B}_t$, that is atoms in $\mathfrak{B}_t$ as follows.

Let $\alpha = \bigwedge_{i\neq j<m} \alpha_{ij}(x_i, x_j) \wedge \bigwedge_{\mu\in In(m-1,m)} \eta_\mu(x_{\mu(0)}, \ldots, x_{\mu(m-2)})$, be an MCA formula in the signature t_1, so that for each $i, j < m$, α_{ij} is either $x_i = x_i$ or $R(x_i, x_j)$ a binary relation symbol in the rainbow signature, and for each $\mu : (m-1) \to m$, η_μ is either $y_S(x_{\mu(0)}, \ldots x_{\mu(m-2)})$ for some y_S in the signature, if for all distinct $i, j < m$, $\alpha_{\mu(i),\mu(j)}$ is not equality nor green, otherwise it is

$x_0 = x_0$ [24]. Then α^{W_1} is mapped to α'^{W_2} where α' is the following MCA formula in the signature t_2: $\bigwedge_{i\neq j<m}\alpha_{ij}(x_i,x_j)\wedge\bigwedge_{i<m}x_m=x_i\wedge\psi_1\wedge\psi_2$ where

$$\psi_1=\bigwedge_{\mu^+\in In(m,m+1),m\notin\mathsf{rng}(\mu^+)}\eta_\mu(x_{\mu^+(0)},\dots,x_{\mu^+(m-1)})$$

and ψ_2 is the same conjunction except that we take those μ^+ for which $m\in\mathsf{rng}(\mu^+)$. The map is extended (to non–atoms) the obvious way.

Proof of (4): We first prove the required for any finite $n>2$. Then using Monk's trick we lift it to the transfinite. We use the construction in [16, Remark 31].

(a) Finite dimensional algebras: The proof in [16] is only sketched. Here we give the details since it will be used in the second part of the paper violating an omitting types theorem. The example shows that the maximality condition in [27, Theorem 3.2.9], reformulated and proved in theorem 7.12 below, cannot be omitted. Witness too, the last paragraph in [27].

We specify the atoms and forbidden triples. The atoms are Id, $\mathsf{g}^i_0:i<2^\kappa$ and $\mathsf{r}_j:1\leq j<\kappa$, all symmetric. The forbidden triples of atoms are all permutations of (Id,x,y) for $x\neq y$, $(\mathsf{r}_j,\mathsf{r}_j,\mathsf{r}_j)$ for $1\leq j<\kappa$ and $(\mathsf{g}^i_0,\mathsf{g}^{i'}_0,\mathsf{g}^{i^*}_0)$ for $i,i',i^*<2^\kappa$. In other words, we forbid all the monochromatic triangles.

Write g_0 for $\{\mathsf{g}^i_0:i<2^\kappa\}$ and r_+ for $\{\mathsf{r}_j:1\leq j<\kappa\}$. Call this atom structure α. Let $\mathfrak{A}$ be the term algebra on this atom structure. We claim that $\mathfrak{A}$, as a relation algebra, has no complete representation. Assume for contradiction that $\mathfrak{A}$ has a complete representation M. Let x,y be points in the representation with $M\models\mathsf{r}_1(x,y)$. For each $i<2^\kappa$, there is a point $z_i\in M$ such that $M\models\mathsf{g}^i_0(x,z_i)\wedge\mathsf{r}_1(z_i,y)$.

Let $Z=\{z_i:i<2^\kappa\}$. Within Z there can be no edges labelled by r_0 so each edge is labelled by one of the κ atoms in r_+. The Erdos-Rado theorem forces the existence of three points $z^1,z^2,z^3\in Z$ such that $M\models\mathsf{r}_j(z^1,z^2)\wedge\mathsf{r}_j(z^2,z^3)\wedge\mathsf{r}_j(z^3,z_1)$, for some single $j<\kappa$. This contradicts the definition of composition in $\mathfrak{A}$ (since we avoided monochromatic triangles). Let S be the set of all atomic $\mathfrak{A}$-networks N with nodes ω such that $\{\mathsf{r}_i:1\leq i<\kappa:\mathsf{r}_i$ is the label of an edge in $N\}$ is finite. Then it is straightforward to show S is an amalgamation class, that is for all $M,N\in S$ if $M\equiv_{ij}N$ then there is $L\in S$ with $M\equiv_i L\equiv_j N$, witness [19, Definition 12.8] for notation. We have S is symmetric, that is, if $N\in S$ and $\theta:\omega\to\omega$ is a finitary function, in the sense that $\{i\in\omega:\theta(i)\neq i\}$ is finite, then $N\theta$ is in S. It follows that the complex algebra $\mathfrak{Ca}(S)\in\mathsf{QEA}_\omega$. Now let X be the set of finite $\mathfrak{A}$-networks N with nodes $\subseteq\kappa$ such that:

1. each edge of N is either (a) an atom of $\mathfrak{A}$ or (b) a cofinite subset of $\mathsf{r}_+=\{\mathsf{r}_j:1\leq j<\kappa\}$ or (c) a cofinite subset of $\mathsf{g}_0=\{\mathsf{g}^i_0:i<2^\kappa\}$ and
2. N is 'triangle-closed', i.e. for all $l,m,n\in\mathsf{nodes}(N)$ we have $N(l,n)\leq N(l,m);N(m,n)$. That means if an edge (l,m) is labelled by Id then $N(l,n)=N(m,n)$ and if $N(l,m),N(m,n)\leq\mathsf{g}_0$ then $N(l,n)\cdot\mathsf{g}_0=0$ and if $N(l,m)=N(m,n)=\mathsf{r}_j$ (some $1\leq j<\omega$) then $N(l,n)\cdot\mathsf{r}_j=0$.

For $N\in X$ let $N'\in\mathfrak{Ca}(S)$ be defined by

$$\{L\in S:L(m,n)\leq N(m,n)\text{ for }m,n\in\mathsf{nodes}(N)\}.$$

For $i\in\omega$, let $N\restriction_{-i}$ be the subgraph of N obtained by deleting the node i. Then if $N\in X$, $i<\omega$ then $\mathsf{c}_iN'=(N\restriction_{-i})'$. The inclusion $\mathsf{c}_iN'\subseteq(N\restriction_{-i})'$ is clear. Conversely, let $L\in(N\restriction_{-i})'$. We seek $M\equiv_i L$ with $M\in N'$. This will prove that $L\in\mathsf{c}_iN'$, as required.

Since $L \in S$ the set $T = \{\mathsf{r}_i \notin L\}$ is infinite. Let T be the disjoint union of two infinite sets $Y \cup Y'$, say. To define the ω-network M we must define the labels of all edges involving the node i (other labels are given by $M \equiv_i L$). We define these labels by enumerating the edges and labeling them one at a time. So let $j \neq i < \kappa$. Suppose $j \in \mathsf{nodes}(N)$. We must choose $M(i,j) \leq N(i,j)$. If $N(i,j)$ is an atom then of course $M(i,j) = N(i,j)$. Since N is finite, this defines only finitely many labels of M. If $N(i,j)$ is a cofinite subset of g_0 then we let $M(i,j)$ be an arbitrary atom in $N(i,j)$. And if $N(i,j)$ is a cofinite subset of r_+ then let $M(i,j)$ be an element of $N(i,j) \cap Y$ which has not been used as the label of any edge of M which has already been chosen (possible, since at each stage only finitely many have been chosen so far). If $j \notin \mathsf{nodes}(N)$ then we can let $M(i,j) = \mathsf{r}_k \in Y$ some $1 \leq k < \kappa$ such that no edge of M has already been labelled by r_k. It is not hard to check that each triangle of M is consistent (we have avoided all monochromatic triangles) and clearly $M \in N'$ and $M \equiv_i L$. The labeling avoided all but finitely many elements of Y', so $M \in S$. So $(N\restriction_{-i})' \subseteq \mathsf{c}_i N'$.

Now let $X' = \{N' : N \in X\} \subseteq \mathfrak{C}a(S)$. Then the subalgebra of $\mathfrak{C}a(S)$ generated by X' is obtained from X' by closing under finite unions. Clearly all these finite unions are generated by X'. We must show that the set of finite unions of X' is closed under all cylindric operations. Closure under unions is given. For $N' \in X$ we have $-N' = \bigcup_{m,n \in \mathsf{nodes}(N)} N'_{mn}$ where N_{mn} is a network with nodes $\{m,n\}$ and labeling $N_{mn}(m,n) = -N(m,n)$. N_{mn} may not belong to X but it is equivalent to a union of at most finitely many members of X. The diagonal $\mathsf{d}_{ij} \in \mathfrak{C}a(S)$ is equal to N' where N is a network with nodes $\{i,j\}$ and labeling $N(i,j) = \mathsf{Id}$. Closure under cylindrification is given. Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be the subalgebra of $\mathfrak{C}a(S)$ generated by X'. Then $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{Ra}(\mathfrak{C})$. To see why, each element of $\mathfrak{A}$ is a union of a finite number of atoms, possibly a co-finite subset of g_0 and possibly a co-finite subset of r_+. Clearly $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq \mathfrak{Ra}(\mathfrak{C})$. Conversely, each element $z \in \mathfrak{Ra}(\mathfrak{C})$ is a finite union $\bigcup_{N \in F} N'$, for some finite subset F of X, satisfying $\mathsf{c}_i z = z$, for $i > 1$. Let $i_0, \ldots, i_k$ be an enumeration of all the nodes, other than 0 and 1, that occur as nodes of networks in F. Then, $\mathsf{c}_{i_0} \ldots \mathsf{c}_{i_k} z = \bigcup_{N \in F} \mathsf{c}_{i_0} \ldots \mathsf{c}_{i_k} N' = \bigcup_{N \in F} (N\restriction_{\{0,1\}})' \in \mathfrak{A}$. So $\mathfrak{Ra}(\mathfrak{C}) \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$. $\mathfrak{A}$ is relation algebra reduct of $\mathfrak{C} \in \mathsf{QEA}_\omega$ but has no Let $n > 2$. Let $\mathfrak{B} = \mathfrak{Nr}_n \mathfrak{C}$. Then $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathfrak{Nr}_n \mathsf{QEA}_\omega$, is atomic, but has no complete representation; in fact, because it is generated by its two dimensional elements, and its dimension is at least three, its Df reduct is not completely representable [25, Proposition 4.10].

Now by theorem 3.6 $\exists$ has a winning strategy in $G_\omega(\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{B})$, hence $\exists$ has a winning strategy in $G_k(\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{B})$ for all $k < \omega$. Using ultrapowers and an elementary chain argument, we get that $\mathfrak{B} \equiv \mathfrak{C}$, so that $\mathfrak{C}$ is atomic and $\exists$ has a winning strategy in $G_\omega(\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{C})$. Since $\mathfrak{C}$ is countable then by [22, Theorem 3.3.3] it is completely representable. We have proved that $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathbf{El}\mathsf{CRK}_n$. We note that $\mathfrak{C}$ is atomless because, as stated in [16, Remark 31], for any $N \in X$, we can add an extra node extending N to M such that $\emptyset \subset M' \subset N'$, so that N' cannot be an atom.

If $n \leq 2$, then $\mathsf{CRK_n}$ is elementary; it coincide with the class of atomic completely additve algebras in $\mathsf{RK_n}$, hence in this case $\mathfrak{Nr}_n \mathfrak{C}$ is completely representable. Indeed, complete additivity of an operator on an atomic BAO is a first order property. If $\mathfrak{A}$ is an atomic BAO and f is a unary modality on $\mathfrak{A}$, then the formula $y \neq 0 \to \exists x(\mathsf{At}(x) \wedge f(x) \cdot y \neq 0)$, where $\mathsf{At}(x)$ is the first order formula asserting that x is an atom, forces f to be completely additive. To see why, let $\mathfrak{A}$ be an atomic algebra with set of atoms X, and with a unary modality f in its signature that validates the above stipulated formula. Then it suffices to show that $\sum_{x \in X} f(x) = 1 (= f(\sum X))$. If not, let $a = 1 - \sum_{x \in X} f(x)$. Then $a \neq 0$. But then (using this formula), there exists $x' \in X$, such that $0 \neq f(x') \cdot a = f(x') \cdot (1 - \sum_{x \in X} f(x)) = f(x') - \sum_{x \in X} f(x)$, which is impossible.

(b) Infinite dimensions: Now, using Monk's trick one more time, we lift the previous result to the transfinite. We use that for any finite ordinal k and any infinite ordinal β, we have (*)

$\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{QEA}_\omega = \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{QEA}_\beta$ [15, Theorem 2.6.35].

For each finite $k \geq 3$, let $\mathfrak{C}(k)$ be an uncountable algebra in $\mathfrak{Nr}_k\mathsf{QEA}_\omega$ that is not completely representable; such algebras were constructed above. Let $I = \{\Gamma : m \subseteq \Gamma \subseteq \alpha, |\Gamma| < \omega\}$. Define F an ultrafilter on $\wp(I)$, ρ_Γ ($\Gamma \subseteq \alpha$) as in the previous item. Let $\mathfrak{C}_\Gamma$ be an algebra similar to QEA_α such that $\mathfrak{Rd}^{\rho_\Gamma}\mathfrak{C}_\Gamma = \mathfrak{C}(|\Gamma|) = \mathfrak{Nr}_{|\Gamma|}\mathfrak{D}_\Gamma \in \mathsf{QEA}_{|\Gamma|}$, where $\mathfrak{D}_\Gamma \in \mathsf{QEA}_{\alpha+\omega}$. Such a $\mathfrak{D}_\Gamma$ exists by (*). Let $\mathfrak{B} = \Pi_{\Gamma/F}\mathfrak{C}_\Gamma$. We will prove that $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathsf{QEA}_{\alpha+\omega}$, and that $\mathfrak{Rd}_{sc}\mathfrak{B}$ is not completely representable.

Let σ_Γ be an injective function $\omega \to (\alpha + \omega)$ such that $\rho_\Gamma \subseteq \sigma_\Gamma$ and $\sigma_\Gamma(|\Gamma| + i) = \alpha + i$ for every $i < \omega$. Let $\mathfrak{A}_\Gamma$ be an algebra similar to a $\mathsf{QEA}_{\alpha+\omega}$ such that $\mathfrak{Rd}^{\sigma_\Gamma}\mathfrak{A}_\Gamma = \mathfrak{D}_\Gamma$. Then from [23, Lemma 3.2], we have $\Pi_{\Gamma/F}\mathfrak{A}_\Gamma \in \mathsf{QEA}_{\alpha+\omega}$. We prove that $\mathfrak{B} = \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\Pi_{\Gamma/F}\mathfrak{A}_\Gamma$. For each $\Gamma \in I$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{Rd}^{\rho_\Gamma}\mathfrak{C}_\Gamma &= \mathfrak{C}(|\Gamma|)\\
&\cong \mathfrak{Nr}_{|\Gamma|}\mathfrak{D}_\Gamma\\
&= \mathfrak{Nr}_{|\Gamma|}\mathfrak{Rd}^{\sigma_\Gamma}\mathfrak{A}_\Gamma\\
&= \mathfrak{Rd}^{\sigma_\Gamma}\mathfrak{Nr}_\Gamma\mathfrak{A}_\Gamma\\
&= \mathfrak{Rd}^{\rho_\Gamma}\mathfrak{Nr}_\Gamma\mathfrak{A}_\Gamma.
\end{aligned}$$

Then from [23, Lemma 3.3], using a standard Loś argument we have:

$$\Pi_{\Gamma/F}\mathfrak{C}_\Gamma \cong \Pi_{\Gamma/F}\mathfrak{Nr}_\Gamma\mathfrak{A}_\Gamma = \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\Pi_{\Gamma/F}\mathfrak{A}_\Gamma.$$

We are through with the first required.

For the second part, we proceed as follows. Assume for contradiction that $\mathfrak{Rd}_{sc}\mathfrak{B}$ (which is atomic) is completely representable, with isomorphism f establishing the complete representation. Identifying set algebras with their domain, we have $f : \mathfrak{Rd}_{sc}\mathfrak{B} \to \wp(V)$, where V is a generalized weak space. Let $3 \leq m < \omega$. Then $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{Rd}_m\mathfrak{Rd}_{sc}\mathfrak{B}$ is completely representable, via $f \restriction \mathfrak{C}$, by noting that $\mathfrak{Rd}_m\wp(V) \cong \wp(W)$ for some W; a generalized space of dimension m, and that this isomorphism preserves infinite intersections.

In more detail, let U be the base of $\mathfrak{D} = \wp(V)$, that is $U = \bigcup_{s\in V} \mathsf{rng}(s)$ and let $d \in \mathfrak{D}$, $d \neq 0$. Fix $x \in d$. For each $s \in {}^nU$, let $s^+ = x \restriction (\alpha \sim n) \cup s$, then $s^+ \in {}^\alpha U$. For $Y \in \mathfrak{D}$, let $g_d(Y) = \{y \in {}^nU : y^+ \in Y\}$. Then $g_d : \mathfrak{Rd}_m\wp(V) \to \wp({}^nU)$ is a homomorphism that preserves infinite intersections, and $g_d(d) \neq 0$. By taking the direct product of images (varying non-zero $d \in \wp(V)$), we get an embedding $g : \mathfrak{Rd}_m\wp(V) \to \mathfrak{C}$, where $\mathfrak{C} \in \mathsf{Gs}_\mathsf{m}$ and g preserves infinite intersections. Then $g \circ (f \restriction \mathfrak{C})$ is the desired complete representation of $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{Rd}_m\mathfrak{Rd}_{sc}\mathfrak{B}$.

We have from the finite dimensional case that $\mathsf{R} = \mathfrak{Ra}\mathfrak{C}$, $\mathfrak{C} \in \mathsf{QEA}_\omega$. Then, for any $2 < m < n < \omega$, the identity map is a complete embedding from $\mathfrak{C}(m) = \mathfrak{Nr}_m\mathfrak{C}$ to $\mathfrak{Rd}_m\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{Rd}_m\mathfrak{C}(n)$. Fix $2 < m < \omega$. For each $\Gamma \in I, m \subseteq \Gamma$, let $I_{|\Gamma|}$ be a complete embedding from $\mathfrak{C}(m)$ into $\mathfrak{Rd}_m\mathfrak{C}(|\Gamma|)$, we know that such an embedding exists. Let $\iota(b) = (I_{|\Gamma|}b : \Gamma \in I)/F$ for $b \in \mathfrak{C}(m)$. Then ι is a complete embedding from $\mathfrak{C}(m)$ into $\mathfrak{Rd}_m\mathfrak{B} = \mathfrak{Rd}_m(\Pi_{\Gamma/F}\mathfrak{C}_\Gamma)$. But $\mathfrak{Rd}_{sc}\mathfrak{C}(m)$ is a complete subalgebra of $\mathfrak{Rd}_m\mathfrak{Rd}_{sc}\mathfrak{B}$, hence $\mathfrak{Rd}_{sc}\mathfrak{C}(m)$ is completely representable, too which is a contradiction.

□

Part two

6 Notions of representability and completions

Before formulating the next theorem we need some preparation.

Let $2 < n < \omega$. Let K be any class between Sc and PEA. Then $\mathsf{SRK_n}$ denotes the class of *strongly representable* $\mathsf{K_n}$s. An algebra $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{SRK_n}$ if $\mathfrak{A}$ *is atomic, completely additive and* $\mathfrak{Cm}\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{RK_n}$. Complete additivity is superfluous for CAs and PEAs. $\mathsf{CRK_n}$ denotes the class of completely representable K_ns. $\mathsf{LK_n}$ denotes the class of algebras satisfying the Lyndon condition adapted to the given signature.

Definition 6.1. Let $\Gamma = (G, E)$ be a graph and C be a non-empty set of 'colours'.

1. A function $f : G \to C$ is called a *C–colouring* of Γ if $(v, w) \in E \implies f(v) \neq f(w)$.

2. The *chromatic number* $\chi(\Gamma)$ of Γ is the smallest $\kappa < \omega$ such that G can be partitioned into κ independent sets, and ∞ if there is no such κ. Equivalently, $\chi(\Gamma)$ is the size of the smallest finite set C such that there exists a C–colouring of Γ, if such a C exists and infinity if there is no such C.

We will also need the following strengthening of [15, Lemma 5.1.50]. In the statement of the lemma α is a finite ordinal. The proof follows easily from the proofs of [15, Theorem 5.1.39, Lemmas 5.1.48-49, Theorems 5.1.50-51]. The only change is that we need the E defined next, to be closed under infinite intersections. Luckily this readily follows from its definition.

Lemma 6.2. *Assume the hypothesis of [15, lemma 5.1.49]. In particular,* $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{CA}_\alpha$ *and* $\mathfrak{Rd}_{df}\mathfrak{A}$ *is representable. Let* $E = \{X \in A : \forall x, y \in {}^\alpha U \& \forall i < \alpha, x_i R y_i \implies (x \in X \iff y \in X)\}$. *($R$ is defined in the lemma cited above). Then* $\{x \in \mathfrak{A} : \Delta x \neq \alpha\} \subseteq E$, *$E$ closed under the operations of* $\mathfrak{A}$, *E is further closed under infinite intersections, and if* $\mathfrak{E}$ *is the subalgebra of* $\mathfrak{A}$ *with domain E, then* $\mathfrak{E} \in \mathsf{RCA}_\alpha$. *In particular, if* $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{CA}_\alpha$, $\mathfrak{Rd}_{df}\mathfrak{A}$ *is representable and* $\mathfrak{A}$ *is generated from* $\{x \in X : \Delta x \neq n\}$ *allowing infinite unions, then* $\mathfrak{A}$ *is representable.*

Proof. Let $X_j : j \in J$ be in E. We will show that $\bigcap_{j \in J} X_j \in E$. Let $x, y \in {}^\alpha U$ such that $x_i R y_i$ for all $i < \alpha$, and assume that $x \in \bigcap_{j \in J} X_j$. Then $x \in X_j$ for every $j \in J$. Now fix $i \in J$. Then $x \in X_i$, and $X_i \in E$, so by definition of E we get that $y \in X_i$. Since i was arbitrary, we get that $y \in \bigcap_{j \in J} X_j$. By symmetry we are done. □

For a class $\mathbf{K}$ of algebras, we let $\mathbf{K} \cap \mathsf{Fin} = \{\mathfrak{A} \in \mathbf{K} : |\mathfrak{A}| < \omega\}$ and $\mathbf{K} \cap \mathsf{Count} = \{\mathfrak{A} \in \mathbf{K} : |\mathfrak{A}| \leq \omega\}$.

Definition 6.3. Let $2 < n < \omega$.

(1) A class $\mathbf{K} \subseteq \mathsf{K}_n$ is *gripped by its atom structures* or briefly gripped, if whenever $\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{At}\mathbf{K} \implies \mathfrak{A} \in \mathbf{K}$. $\mathbf{K}$ is *strongly gripped* if $\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A} \in \mathbf{El}\mathsf{At}\mathbf{K} \implies \mathfrak{A} \in \mathbf{K}$.

(2) An ω–rounded game $\mathbf{G}$ is *gripping* for a class $\mathbf{K} \subseteq \mathsf{K}_n$, if whenever $\alpha \in \mathsf{At}\mathbf{K}$ is countable, and $\exists$ has a winning strategy in $\mathbf{G}(\alpha)$, then for any $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{K}_n$, such that $\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A} = \alpha \implies \mathfrak{A} \in \mathbf{K}$. We say that $\mathbf{G}$ *grips* $\mathbf{K}$.

(3) A class $\mathbf{K} \subseteq \mathsf{RK_n}$ is *finitely dense via atom structures*, or simply finitely dense in $\mathsf{RK_n}$, if $\mathsf{At}(\mathbf{K} \cap \mathsf{Fin}) = \mathsf{At}(\mathsf{RK_n} \cap \mathsf{Fin})$.

Example 6.4. (1) By the first item of theorem 4.12 for $1 < n < m$, the class $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_m$ is not gripped, while $\mathsf{CRK_n}$ for $n < \omega$ is gripped, but is not strongly gripped by the first item of theorem 5.1.

(2) For $2 < n < \omega$, G_ω grips $\mathsf{CRA_n}$, $\mathsf{LCA_n}$, $\mathsf{SRCA_n}$ and $\mathsf{RCA_n}$ but it does not grip $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega$ by first item of theorem 4.12. To see why, using the cylindric reduct of the algebras $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$ in this item, continuing to denote them by $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$, we have $\mathfrak{B}$ is completely representable, and has countably many atoms, therefore by [22, Theorem 3.3.3], $\exists$ has a winning strategy in G_ω, furthermore $\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{B} = \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A} \in \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega$, but $\mathfrak{B} \notin \mathbf{El}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega \supseteq \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega$. Note that by the second item of theorem 4.12 the last inclusion is proper.

(3) All of the above four classes are finitely dense in $\mathsf{RCA_n}$ because for a finite algebra $\mathfrak{A}$, $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{CRCA}_n \iff \mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{RCA_n}$. We will show below that $\mathfrak{Nr}_3\mathsf{K}_\omega$ is not finitely dense in $\mathsf{RK_3}$.

Concerning the result proved in item (ii), it is known that for $2 < n < \omega$, $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_{n+1}$ is atom–canonical, because it has a finite Sahlqvist axiomatization. The case $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_{n+2}$ remains unknown (at least to us). Now assume that k is finite ≥ 1. Let

$$\mathsf{V}_k = \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_{n+k}.$$

Then $\mathsf{StrV_k} = \mathsf{AtV_k} \iff \mathsf{V_k}$ is atom–canonical $\iff \mathsf{V_k}$ is closed under Dedekind–MacNeille completions $\iff \mathbf{SC}m\mathsf{AtV_k} = \mathsf{V_k} \iff \mathbf{HSP}\mathsf{AtV_k} = \mathsf{V_k}$ [19, Theorem 2.88].

Theorem 6.5. *Let $2 < n < \omega$ and K be any class between Sc and PEA. Then the following hold:*

(1) For $k \geq 3$, and $\mathsf{K} \in \{\mathsf{CA}, \mathsf{PEA}\}$, $\mathsf{V_k}$ is not any of the above.

(2) For $3 \leq k < \omega$, the classes of K_ns, having complete: $n + k$–flat, infinitary–$n + k$ flat, $n + k$–smooth, representations are not elementary, for any $k \geq 3$. If K has a CA reduct, then the class of K_ns having complete $n + k$–flat representations is not elementary.

(3) For K between Sc and PEA, the classes of K_ns having $n + k$–relativized representations as in the previous item, are varieties, that are not finitely axiomatizable for $k \geq 2$ and, together with the K_ns having $n + k$–square representations are all canonical varieties, but they are not atom–canonical for $k \geq 3$. In particular, $\mathbf{L}_{n,n+k} = \mathsf{PEA}_n \cap \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{G}_{n+k} = \{\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{PEA}_{n+k} : \mathfrak{A}$ has an $n + k$–square representation$\}$ is a canonical variety, that is not atom–canonical for $k \geq 3$. Furthermore, $\mathsf{RPEA_n} = \bigcap_{\mathsf{k}\in\omega} \mathbf{L}_{\mathsf{n,n+k}}$.

(4) For any infinite cardinal κ, for any K between Sc and PEA, the class of algebras having complete κ–square representations is not elementary.

(5) There is a finite $k > n$ such that $\mathsf{Str}(\mathsf{V}_l)$ is not elementary for all $l \geq k$.

(6) The classes $\mathsf{CRK_n}$, $\mathsf{LK_n}$ and SRK_n are gripped and their elementary closure is finitely axiomatizable $\iff n \leq 2$, and with the exception of $\mathsf{LK_n}$, are not strongly gripped for $n > 2$. The class $[\mathsf{RK_n} \cap \mathsf{At}]^{\mathsf{ad}}$ is gripped $\iff n \leq 1$ or $n = 2$ and $\mathsf{K} \in \{\mathsf{CA}, \mathsf{PEA}\}$. If $2 < n < m < \omega$, then any class K between CA and PEA, the class $\mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n[\mathsf{K}_m \cap \mathsf{At}]$ is gripped, but not strongly gripped if $m \geq n + 3$.

(7) Let $\mathbf{N} = \{\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{K}_n^{\mathsf{ad}} \cap \mathsf{At} : \mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At} \in \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega\}$. *Then* $\mathbf{N} \neq \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega \cap \mathsf{At}$, $\mathbf{N} \subseteq \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega^{\mathsf{ad}} \cap \mathsf{At}$, $\mathbf{N} \cap \mathsf{Count} \subseteq \mathsf{CRK}_{\mathsf{n}}$*; the last two inclusions are proper, and* $\mathbf{N}$ *is not elementary. Let* $\mathbf{K}_1 = \mathsf{CRK}_n \cap \mathbf{El}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega$ *and* $\mathbf{K}_2 = \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega \cap \mathbf{El}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega \cap \mathsf{At}$. *Then these are distinct classes that lie strictly between* $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega$ *and* $\mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega$*, but* $\mathbf{K}_1$ *and* $\mathbf{K}_2$ *coincide on algebras having countably many atoms.*

(8) For $1 < n < m$*, the class* $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_m$ *is not gripped. There is a non–atomic game* $\mathbf{G}$ *that grips* $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega$

(9) The class $\mathfrak{Nr}_3\mathsf{K}_\omega$ *is not finitely dense via atom structures in* RK_3.

Proof. Fix $2 < n < \omega$.

(1) $\mathsf{V_k}$ is canonical because if $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D}$, with $\mathfrak{D} \in \mathsf{K}_m$, then $\mathfrak{A}^+ \subseteq_c \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D}^+$. It is not atom–canonical by item (2) of theorem 5.1. The first required then follows.

(2) We first show that an existence of a complete infinitary m–flat representation of $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{Sc}_n$ implies the existence of an atomic *completely additive* m–dilation. We have already dealt with atomicity in lemma 3.6. Let $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{Sc}_n$ and let M be a complete infinitary m–flat representation of $\mathfrak{A}$. Then, as in the proof of the second item of lemma 3.6, one forms the dilation $\mathfrak{D}$ with universe $\{\phi^{\mathfrak{M}} : \phi \in \mathfrak{L}(A)^m_{\infty,\omega}\}$ but counting in *equality*.

This algebra is an atomic CA_m, hence it is completely additive. Now $\mathfrak{A}$ completely embeds into $\mathfrak{Rd}_{sc}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D} = \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{Rd}_{sc}\mathfrak{D}$, via the same map denoted by θ in the proof of the first item of lemma 3.6, defined via $r \mapsto r(\bar{x})^M$, since this latter map is still atomic in this new context (using the same reasoning in the earlier context). Then $\mathfrak{Rd}_{sc}\mathfrak{D}$ is of course still atomic and completely additive.

Let $\mathfrak{C} = \mathsf{PEA}_{\mathbb{Z},\mathbb{N}} \in \mathsf{PEA}_n$ be as in item (1) of theorem 5.1. Then $\mathfrak{Rd}_{sc}\mathfrak{C} \notin \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{Sc}_{n+3}^{\mathsf{ad}}$, hence by item (2) in lemma 3.5 and the above, with the fact that, for all finite $k \geq 3$, $\mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_{n+k}^{\mathsf{ad}} \subseteq \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_{n+3}^{\mathsf{ad}}$, $\mathfrak{Rd}_{sc}\mathfrak{C}$, $\mathfrak{Rd}_{\mathsf{K}}\mathfrak{C}$, does not have a complete $n+k$–flat representation, *a priori*, a complete infinitary $n+k$–flat (nor an $n+k$–smooth) representation. But $\mathfrak{C}$ is elementary equivalent to a countable $\mathfrak{B}$, which is completely representable, hence $\mathfrak{Rd}_{\mathsf{K}}\mathfrak{B}$, has all types of $m > n$ relativized representations.

If K has a CA reduct then $\mathsf{K}_m^{\mathsf{ad}} = \mathsf{K}_m$ for all m, and so $\mathfrak{Rd}_{\mathsf{K}}\mathfrak{C} \notin \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_{n+3}$, hence by the above argument, and now using the third item of lemma 3.5, we get that $\mathfrak{Rd}_{\mathsf{K}}\mathfrak{A}$ does not have a complete m–flat representation, but $\mathfrak{Rd}_{\mathsf{K}}\mathfrak{A} \equiv \mathfrak{Rd}_{\mathsf{K}}\mathfrak{B}$, and $\mathfrak{Rd}_{\mathsf{K}}\mathfrak{B}$ has a complete m–flat representation, because it is completely representable.

(3) For the third required, all such classes, except for the one involving squareness, are equal by first item of lemma 3.5 to $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_{n+k}$. For finite $k \geq 1$, the variety $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_{n+k+1}$ is not finitely axiomatizable over $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_{n+k}$ [23, Corollary 3.3].

We now show that the class V of $\mathsf{K_n}$ having m–square representations is a canonical variety. When $\mathsf{K} = \mathsf{PEA}$, then $\mathsf{V} = \mathbf{L}_{n,m}$. We start by showing that V is a variety.

Closure under subalgebras is obvious. Products is also easy; given $\mathfrak{A}_i$s, $i \in I$ (I a non–empty indexing set), with m–square representations, we have $\mathfrak{A}_i^+$ has a complete m–square representation, by last item in lemma 3.6, so $\mathfrak{A}_i^+$ has an m–dimensional basis $\mathfrak{M}_i$, by the proof of item (ii) in lemma 3.6. We can assume that the $\mathfrak{A}_i^+$s are pairwise disjoint; accordingly let $\mathfrak{C}$ be the complex algebra over the atom structure of disjoint unions of those of the $\mathfrak{A}_i^+$. Then $\mathfrak{C}$ is complete and atomic; $\mathbf{P}_{i\in I}\mathfrak{A}_i$ embeds in $\mathfrak{C}$, and $\bigcup \mathfrak{M}_i$ is the desired basis.

Now we check closure under homomorphic images. The proof is the CA analogue of [19, Proposition 12.31] formulated for relation algebras and attributed to Maddux. Assume that $\mathfrak{A}$ has an m–square representation and let $h : \mathfrak{A} \to \mathfrak{B}$ be surjective. We want to show that $\mathfrak{B}$ has an m–square representation, too. Again, by last item of lemma 3.6, we have $\mathfrak{A}^+$ has an m–dimensional basis $\mathfrak{M}$. Let $K = ker(h)$ and let $z = -\sum^{\mathfrak{A}^+} K$. (The last sum exists, because $\mathfrak{A}^+$ is complete). Let $\mathfrak{D}$ be the relativization of $\mathfrak{A}^+$ to z. Then $\mathfrak{D}$ is complete and atomic.

Define $g : \mathfrak{A}^+ \to \mathfrak{D}$ by $a \mapsto a \cdot z$. Then $\mathfrak{B}$ embeds in $\mathfrak{D}$ via $b \mapsto g(a)$, for any $a \in h^{-1}[b]$. Hence $\{N \in \mathfrak{M} : N(\bar{x}) \in \mathfrak{D}\}$ is a basis for $\mathfrak{D}$, and since $\mathfrak{B}$ (up to isomorphism) is a subalgebra of $\mathfrak{D}$, we get that $\mathfrak{B}$ has an m–square representation, because $\mathfrak{D}$ does.

Canonicity is straightforward by the proof of lemma 3.6. If $\mathfrak{A}$ has an m–square representation, then $\mathfrak{A}^+$ has an m–dimensional basis, hence it has an m–square representation, too; and in fact a complete one. Finally, non atom–canonicity follows directly from item (iii) of theorem 5.1.

If $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{RPEA_n}$, then $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{PEA_{n+k}} \subseteq \mathbf{L}_{\mathsf{n},\mathsf{n+k}}$ for any $k \in \omega$, hence $\mathsf{RPEA_n} \subseteq \bigcap_{\mathsf{k}\in\omega} \mathbf{L}_{\mathsf{n},\mathsf{n+k}}$. Conversely, assume that $\mathfrak{A} \in \bigcap_{k\in\omega} \mathbf{L}_{n,n+k}$ is countable. Then $\mathfrak{A}$ has an m–square representation for every finite $m \geq n$. Using a compactness argument, one shows that $\mathfrak{A}$ has an ω–square representation. One can build, in a step–by–step manner, a chain of larger and larger finite cliques (as defined in the proof of theorem 4.3) resolving more and more 'cylindrification' defects, so that their union will have no defects. Being a clique, the union will be a classical representation (here countability of $\mathfrak{A}$ is essential). Since a classical representation is obviously ω–square, we get that $\bigcap_{k\in\omega} \mathbf{L}_{n,n+k}$ and $\mathsf{RPEA_m}$ coincide on simple countable algebras. But each is a variety (since $\mathbf{L}_{n,n+k}$ is a variety for each $k \in \omega$), with discriminator term $\mathsf{c}_{(n)}x$, so that they are both discriminator varieties, agreeing on countable (simple) algebras, so they are equal.

(4) Now let K be any class between Sc and PEA, and let κ be any infinite cardinal. Let $\mathfrak{C} = \mathsf{PEA}_{\mathbb{Z},\mathbb{N}}$. Then $\mathfrak{Rd}_{\mathsf{K}}\mathfrak{C}$ does not have a complete κ–square representation, for such a representation necessarily induces an (ordinary) complete representation of $\mathfrak{Rd}_{\mathsf{K}}\mathfrak{C}$, because $\mathfrak{C}$ has countably many atoms. But $\mathfrak{Rd}_{\mathsf{K}}\mathfrak{B}$ has a complete κ–square representation, because it is completely representable.

(5) We start by reproving a result of Bulian and Hodkinson [11]. We show that the class $\mathsf{SRK_n}$ $(2 < n < \omega)$ is not elementary. Define the polyadic operations corresponding to transpositions using the notation in [22, Definition 3.6.6], in the context of defining atom structures from classes of models by $R_{\mathsf{s}_{[ij]}} = \{([f], [g]) : f \circ [i, j] = g\}$. This is well defined. In particular, we can (and will) assume that $\mathfrak{M}(\Gamma)$ defined in [22, Top of p.78] has the signature of polyadic equality algebra.

For a graph G, recall that $\chi(G)$ denotes its chromatic number. We claim that if $\chi(\Gamma) = \infty$, then $\mathfrak{M}(\Gamma)$ is representable as a polyadic equality algebra and if $\chi(\Gamma) < \infty$, then $\mathfrak{Rd}_{df}\mathfrak{M}(\Gamma)$ is not representable by lemma 6.2.

Here networks are changed by adding a consistency condition for the substitution operators corresponding to transpositions. But the atomic (usual) game is the same. In more detail, in the proof of lemma [22, Lemma 3.64], replacing S by $\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{M}(\Gamma)$, then in the possibly transfinite game $G^{|\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{M}(\Gamma)|+\omega}\mathfrak{M}(\Gamma)$, we do not need to worry about the starting point. But the reponse of $\exists$ to the current $N \downarrow$ (using the notion in the proof of the above cited lemma) played by $\forall$ during the play, is easily seen to be symmetric, in the sense that for all $i < j < n$, it satisfies $\mathsf{s}_{[i,j]}M(\bar{x}) = M(\bar{x} \circ [i, j])$, given (inductively) that $N \downarrow$ is symmetric. So symmetry is preserved at successor ordinals. Limits obviously preserves symmetry, too, so $\mathfrak{M}(\Gamma) \in \mathsf{RPEA_n}$, and in fact, the representation defined, induces a complete representation of $\mathfrak{M}(\Gamma)^+$.

The Df reduct of $\mathfrak{M}(\Gamma)$ is not representable, because $\mathfrak{M}(\Gamma)$ is generated completely by $\{x \in$

$\mathfrak{M}(\Gamma) : \Delta x \neq n\}$.This prompts (borrowing the terminology from Hirsch and Hodkinson):

- A graph Γ is *good* if $\chi(\Gamma) = \infty$. A Monk's algebra $\mathfrak{M}(\Gamma)$ is *good* if Γ is good, so that it is representable as a $\mathsf{PEA_n}$.

- A graph Γ is *bad* if $\chi(\Gamma) < \infty$. A Monk's algebra $\mathfrak{M}(\Gamma)$ is *bad* if Γ is bad, so that its Df reduct is not representable.

Then Using Erdos' probabalistic graphs, one constructs a sequence of good Monk algebras converging to a bad one. As before, for each finite κ there is a finite graph G_κ with $\chi(G_\kappa) > \kappa$ and with no cycles of length $< \kappa$. Let Γ_κ be the disjoint union of the G_l for $l > \kappa$. Clearly, $\chi(\Gamma_\kappa) = \infty$, and so the *polyadic equality algebra* $\mathfrak{M}(\Gamma_\kappa)$ is representable. Now let Γ be a non-principal ultraproduct $\Pi_D\Gamma_\kappa$ for the Γ_κs. For $\kappa < \omega$, let σ_κ be a first-order sentence of the signature of the graphs stating that there are no cycles of length less than κ. Then $\Gamma_l \models \sigma_\kappa$ for all $l \geq \kappa$. By Loś's Theorem, $\Gamma \models \sigma_\kappa$ for all κ. So Γ has no cycles, and hence by $\chi(\Gamma) \leq 2$. Thus $\mathfrak{Rd}_{df}\mathfrak{M}(\Gamma)$ is not representable. (The algebra $\mathfrak{Tm}(\rho(\Gamma))$ is representable, because the class of weakly representable atom structures is elementary [19, Theorem 2.84].)

(6) Let $\mathfrak{A}_i$ be the sequence of (strongly) representable QEA_n with $\mathfrak{Cm}\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}_i = \mathfrak{A}_i$ such that the diagonal free reduct of $\mathfrak{A} = \Pi_{i/U}\mathfrak{A}_i$ is not strongly representable as constructed above. Hence $\mathfrak{Rd}_{\mathsf{K}}\mathfrak{Cm}\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{Cm}\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{Rd}_{\mathsf{K}}\mathfrak{A} \notin \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega = \bigcap_{i\in\omega}\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_{n+i}$, so $\mathfrak{Rd}_{\mathsf{K}}\mathfrak{Cm}\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A} \notin \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_l$ for all $l > k$, for some $k \in \omega$, $k > n$. But for each such l, $\mathfrak{Rd}_{\mathsf{K}}\mathfrak{A}_i \in \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_l \subseteq \mathsf{RK_n}$, so $\mathfrak{Rd}_{\mathsf{K}}\mathfrak{A}_i$ is a sequence of algebras such that $\mathfrak{Cm}\mathsf{At}(\mathfrak{Rd}_{\mathsf{K}}\mathfrak{A}_i) = \mathfrak{Rd}_{\mathsf{K}}\mathfrak{Cm}\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}_i = \mathfrak{Rd}_{\mathsf{K}}\mathfrak{A}_i \in \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_l$, but $\mathfrak{Cm}(\mathsf{At}(\mathfrak{Rd}_{\mathsf{K}}(\Pi_{i/U}\mathfrak{A}_i)) = \mathfrak{Cm}\mathsf{At}(\mathfrak{Rd}_{\mathsf{K}}\mathfrak{A}) \notin \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_l$, for all $l \geq k$.

(7) It is easy to see that all of CRK_n, $\mathsf{LK_n}$ and $\mathsf{SRK_n}$ ($n \in \omega$) are gripped. If $n \leq 2$, all classes coincide with atomic completely additive algebras in $\mathsf{RK_n}$, hence are all elementary and finitely axiomatizable. For $n > 2$, and any $\mathbf{K}$ such that $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega \subseteq \mathbf{K} \subseteq \mathsf{RK_n}$, $\mathbf{ElK}$ is not finitely axiomatizable as proved in the last item of theorem 4.12.

Let $2 < n < \omega$. Then $\mathsf{LK_n}$ is strongly gripped, because it is elementary and gripped, $\mathsf{CRK_n}$ is not strongly gripped, for using the algebras in item (1) of theorem 5.1, $\mathsf{At}\mathsf{PEA}_{\mathbb{Z},\mathbb{N}} \equiv \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{B}$, where $\mathfrak{B}$ is completely representable but $\mathsf{PEA}_{\mathbb{Z},\mathbb{N}}$ is not.

SRK_n is not strongly gripped, because there is a strongly representable atom structure β, that is elementary equivalent to an atom structure α that is not strongly representable.

By the second item of theorem 5.1, $\mathsf{RK_n}$ for any $n > 2$ is not gripped, for there is a weakly representable K_n atom structure, that is not strongly representable. Furthermore, there are algebras based on this atom structure that are completely additive, so we obtain the analogous result for $[\mathsf{RK}_\alpha \cap \mathsf{At}]^{\mathsf{ad}}$. In particular, both classes are not strongly gripped. For $n = 2$, and $\mathsf{K} \in \{\mathsf{PA}, \mathsf{Sc}\}$, the class $[\mathsf{RK}_2 \cap \mathsf{At}]^{\mathsf{ad}}$ is not gripped, because there exists an atomic algebra $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{RK}_2$ that is not completely additive, witness example 3.4. Hence $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{Cm}\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$ share the same atom structure, $\mathfrak{A}$ is not completely additive, while $\mathfrak{Cm}\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$ is completely additive. It is easy to see, that for $n \leq 1$, $\mathsf{K}_\alpha \cap \mathsf{At} = \mathsf{RK_n} \cap \mathsf{At} = [\mathsf{RK_n} \cap \mathsf{At}]^{\mathsf{ad}}$ is gripped. On the other hand, for $n = 2$ and $\mathsf{K} \in \{\mathsf{CA}, \mathsf{PEA}\}$, $[\mathsf{RK}_2 \cap \mathsf{At}]^{\mathsf{ad}} = \mathsf{RK}_2 \cap \mathsf{At}$ is gripped, because any weakly representable atom structure of dimension 2 is strongly representable since RK_2 is a Sahlqvist conjugated variety; in particular, it is completely additive.

Now fix $2 < n < m < \omega$ and K between CA and PEA. Assume that $\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{At}\mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n[\mathsf{K}_m \cap \mathsf{At}]$. We want to show that $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n[\mathsf{K}_m \cap \mathsf{At}]$. We can assume without loss that $\mathfrak{A}$ is simple. If not, then one works with the simple components, like in the proof of theorem 4.2. We have

$\mathfrak{TmAt}\mathfrak{A} \in \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n[\mathsf{K}_m \cap \mathsf{At}]$ and is also simple; furthermore $\mathfrak{TmAt}\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{Cm}\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A} = \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{TmAt}\mathfrak{A} = \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{Cm}\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$. By lemma 3.5, $\mathfrak{TmAt}\mathfrak{A}$ has a complete infinitary m–flat representation M. So let $f : \mathfrak{TmAt}\mathfrak{A} \to \wp(1^M)$ be an injective homomorphism, where M is a complete infinitary m–flat representation of $\mathfrak{TmAt}\mathfrak{A}$. For $a \in \mathfrak{Cm}\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$, $a = \sum\{x \in \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A} : x \leq a\}$, say, define $\bar{f}(a) = \bigcup\{f(x) : x \in \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}\}$. Then $\bar{f} \restriction \mathfrak{A} \to \wp(1^M)$ gives a complete infinitary m–flat representation of $\mathfrak{A}$, so again by lemma 3.5, we get that $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n[\mathsf{K}_m \cap \mathsf{At}]$ and we are done.

Assume further that $m \geq n+3$. Then $\mathsf{AtPEA}_{\mathbb{Z},\mathbb{N}} \in \mathbf{El}\mathsf{At}\mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n[\mathsf{PEA}_m \cap \mathsf{At}]$, because $\mathsf{AtPEA}_{\mathbb{Z},\mathbb{N}} \equiv \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{B} \in \mathsf{At}\mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n[\mathsf{QEA}_\omega \cap \mathsf{At}]$, by theorem 4.2, but $\mathfrak{Rd}_{ca}\mathsf{PEA}_{\mathbb{Z},\mathbb{N}} \notin \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_m$, *a fortiori*, it is not in $\mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n[\mathsf{CA}_m \cap \mathsf{At}]$. We have shown that $\mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n[\mathsf{K}_m \cap \mathsf{At}]$ is not strongly gripped.

For the second part. Let $\mathfrak{B}$ be the algebra in the second item of theorem 4.12. Then $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathbf{K}_1 \cap \mathbf{K}_2 \sim \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega$. On the other hand, the $\mathfrak{B}$ constructed in the first item of the same theorem, is outside $\mathbf{El}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega$, but is completely representable, hence $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega \sim \mathbf{K}_1 \cup \mathbf{K}_2$. Furthermore, $\mathbf{K}_1 \subseteq \mathbf{K}_2$ by theorem 4.2, but $\mathbf{K}_1 \neq \mathbf{K}_2$ by the K_n constructed in the first part of the last item of theorem 5.1 which is in $\mathbf{K}_1 \sim \mathbf{K}_2$, because it is in $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega$, but lacks a complete representation. The last part follows from theorem 4.2.

(8) The class $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_m$ $(1 < n < m)$ is not gripped by the first item of theorem 4.12. Now we work only with CAs. We define a non–atomic ω rounded game $\mathbf{G}$ stronger than H used in item (1) of theorem 5.1 (permitting non-atomic labels) that grips $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega$, in the sense of the first item of definition 6.3, that is, if $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathsf{CA}_n$, $|\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{B}| \leq \omega$, $\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{B} \in \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega$ and $\exists$ has a winning strategy in $\mathbf{G}(\mathfrak{B})$, then $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega$.

The game is played on both λ–neat hypernetworks defined in the proof of item (1) of theorem 5.1 and complete labelled graphs (possibly by non–atoms) with no consistency conditions. The play at a certain point, like in H as in item (1) of theorem 5.1, will be a λ–neat hypernetwork, call its network part X, and we write $X(\bar{x})$ for the atom that labels the edge $\bar{x}$.

An n– matrix is a finite complete graph with nodes including $0, \ldots, n-1$ with all edges labelled by *arbitrary elements* of $\mathfrak{B}$. No consistency properties are assumed. $\forall$ can play an arbitrary n–matrix N, $\exists$ must replace $N(0, \ldots, n-1)$, by some element $a \in \mathfrak{B}$.

The final move is that $\forall$ can pick a previously played n–matrix N, and pick any tuple $\bar{x} = (x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1})$ whose atomic label is below $N(0, \ldots, n-1)$. $\exists$ must respond by extending X to X' such that there is an embedding θ of N into X' such that $\theta(0) = x_0 \ldots, \theta(n-1) = x_{n-1}$ and for all $i_0, \ldots i_{n-1} \in N$, we have

$$X(\theta(i_0) \ldots, \theta(i_{n-1})) \leq N(i_0, \ldots, i_{n-1}).$$

This ensures that in the limit, the constraints in N really define the element a.

If $\exists$ has a winning strategy in $\mathbf{G}(\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{B})$, for $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathsf{CA}_n$, then the extra move on matrices, ensures that that every n–dimensional element generated by $\mathfrak{B}$ in the dilation $\mathfrak{D} \in \mathsf{RCA}_\omega$ that is constructed in the play, is an element of $\mathfrak{B}$ so that $\mathfrak{B}$ *exhausts all n–dimensional elements* of $\mathfrak{D}$, thus $\mathfrak{B} \cong \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D}$ ($\mathfrak{D}$ as in the first item of theorem 5.1) and so $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega$.

(9) Now we construct a finite $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{RK}_3 \sim \mathfrak{Nr}_3\mathsf{K}_\omega$. Take the finite polyadic equality algebra $\mathfrak{A}$ consisting of 3 by 3 matrices (as defined by Maddux, see e.g. [15, pp.221]) over any integral (hence simple) non–permutational relation algebra R. Such relation algebras exist [16, Theorem 36]. The algebra $\mathfrak{A}$ is of course completely representable. Let $\alpha = \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{Rd}_{sc}\mathfrak{A}$. Assume for contradiction that $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathfrak{Nr}_3\mathsf{K}_\omega$ and $\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{B} = \alpha$.

Then we have (∗) $\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{Rd}_{sc}\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{Nr}_3\mathsf{Sc}_\omega$. We claim that $\mathfrak{Rd}_{sc}\mathfrak{A}$ has a 3–homogeneous complete representation, which is impossible, because R does not have a homogeneous representation.

It can be shown, using (*) together with arguments similar to [16, Theorems 33, 34, 35], that $\exists$ has a winning strategy in an ω–rounded game played on $\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$ where $\forall$ is offered three moves, as in the proof of item (1) in theorem 5.1, but played on networks rather than λ–neat hypernetworks. We do not have hyperedges labelled by non–atoms. This game also has three moves, namely, a cylindrifier move, a transformation move, and an amalgamation move but now in amalgamation moves, the networks $\forall$ chooses can overlap only on at most 3 nodes.

We use the notation in the proof of lemma 3.6 given in the first part of the paper. Like in lemma 3.6 and last item in theorem 4.2, the winning strategy for $\exists$ is to play networks N with $\mathsf{nodes}(N) \subseteq \omega$ such that $\widehat{N} \neq 0$ (here $\widehat{N}$ is as defined in the proof of lemma 3.6).

In the initial round, let $\forall$ play $a \in \mathsf{At}$. $\exists$ plays a network N with $N(0,1,2) = a$. Then $\widehat{N} = a \neq 0$. The response to the cylindrifier move is like in the first part of lemma 3.6.

For transformation moves: if $\forall$ plays (M, θ), then it is easy to see that we have $\widehat{M\theta} \neq 0$, so this response is maintained in the next round.

We write $\bar{i}$ for $\{i_0, i_1, i_2\}$, if it occurs as a set, and we write $\mathsf{s}_{\bar{i}}$ short for $\mathsf{s}_{i_0}\mathsf{s}_{i_1}\mathsf{s}_{i_2}$. Finally, if $\forall$ plays the amalgamation move (M, N) where $\mathsf{nodes}(M) \cap \mathsf{nodes}(N) = \{\bar{i}\}$, then $M(\bar{i}) = N(\bar{i})$. Let $\mu = \mathsf{nodes}(M) \sim \bar{i}$ and $\nu = \mathsf{nodes}(N) \sim \bar{i}$ Then $\mathsf{c}_{(\nu)}\widehat{M} = \widehat{M}$ and $\mathsf{c}_{(u)}\widehat{N} = \widehat{M}$. Hence $\mathsf{c}_{(u)}\widehat{M} = \mathsf{s}_{\bar{i}}M(\bar{i}) = \mathsf{s}_{\bar{i}}N(\bar{i}) = \mathsf{c}_{(\nu)}\widehat{N}$ so $\mathsf{c}_{(\nu)}\widehat{M} = \widehat{M} \leq \mathsf{c}_{(u)}\widehat{M} = \mathsf{c}_{(\nu)}\widehat{N}$ and $\widehat{M} \cdot \widehat{N} \neq 0$. So there is L with $\mathsf{nodes}(L) = \mathsf{nodes}(M) \cup \mathsf{nodes}(N) \neq 0$, and $\widehat{L} \cdot x \neq 0$, where $\widehat{M} \cdot \widehat{N} = x$, thus $\widehat{L} \cdot \widehat{M} \neq 0$ and consequently $\widehat{L}{\restriction}_{\mathsf{nodes}(M)} = \widehat{M}{\restriction}_{\mathsf{nodes}(M)}$, hence $M \subseteq L$ and similarly $N \subseteq L$, so that L is the required amalgam.

We can assume that $\mathfrak{A}$ is simple, because R is. Let $a \in \mathfrak{A}$ be non-zero. $\exists$ uses her winning strategy to define a sequence of networks $N_0 \subseteq \dots N_r \subseteq \omega$, such that N_0 is $\exists$'s response to $\forall$'s move choosing a in the initial round.

This sequence respects the cylindrifier move, in the sense that if $N_r(\bar{x}) \leq \mathsf{c}_i b$ for $\bar{x} \in \mathsf{nodes}(N_r)$, then there exists $N_s \supseteq N_r$ and a node $k \in \omega \sim N_r$ such that $N_s(\bar{y}) = b$; where $\bar{y} \equiv_i \bar{x}$ and $\bar{y}_i = k$, and it also respects partial isomorphisms, in the sense that if if $\bar{x}, \bar{y} \in \mathsf{nodes}(N_r)$ such that $N_r(\bar{x}) = N_r(\bar{y})$, then there is a finite surjective map θ extending $\{(x_i, y_i) : i < n\}$ mapping onto $\mathsf{nodes}(N_r)$ such that $\mathsf{dom}(\theta) \cap \mathsf{nodes}(N_r) = \bar{y}$, and finally there is an extension $N_s \supseteq N_r$, $N_r\theta$ (some $s \geq r$).

Let N_a be the limit of such networks. Define the required representation $\mathcal{N}$ of $\mathfrak{A}$ having domain $\bigcup_{a \in A} \mathsf{nodes}(N_a)$, by

$$S^{\mathcal{N}} = \{\bar{x} : \exists a \in A, \exists s \in S, N_a(\bar{x}) = s\},$$

for any subset S of $\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$. Then this is a complete 3–homogeneous representation of $\mathfrak{A}$. We have shown that $\alpha \notin \mathsf{At}(\mathfrak{Nr}_3\mathsf{K}_\omega \cap \mathsf{Fin})$, and we are done. [3] □

Theorem 6.6. *Assume that $2 < n < \omega$. Then $\forall$ can win $\mathbf{G}_k(\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{Rd}_{ca}\mathsf{PEA}_{\mathbb{Z},\mathbb{N}})$ for $k \geq 3$. If $\mathbf{El}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega \subseteq \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_{n+k}$ for some $k \geq 3$, then the following* CA *analogue of [16, Theorem 45] is false. Any class $\mathbf{K}$ such that $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega \subset \mathbf{K} \subset \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_{n+3}$ is not elementary. This also implies that if At, is a countable atom structure such that $\exists$ has a winning strategy in $\mathbf{G}_k(\mathsf{At})$ for all $k \in \omega$, then $\exists$ has a winning strategy in $F^\omega(\mathsf{At}) = G_\omega(\mathsf{At})$.*

Proof. We omit the proof of the first part. For the second part $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{El}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega$ is a counterexample. The third part follows from the second, since such an atom structure At will witness that any class

[3] It seems likely that the result lifts to higher dimension by using the lifting argument in [25].

$\mathbf{K}$ such that $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega \subseteq \mathbf{K} \subseteq \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega$ is not elementary. To see why, let $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At} \in \mathsf{CA}_n$. A winning strategy for $\exists$ in $\mathbf{G}_k$ for all $k \in \omega$ implies that $\exists$ has a winning strategy in $\mathbf{G}(\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{B})$ for some countable atomic $\mathfrak{B}$, such that $\mathfrak{B} \equiv \mathfrak{C}$. But since $\mathbf{G}$ grips $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega$, we get that $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega$. Now assume for contradiction hat $\forall$ has a winning strategy in $G_\omega(\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{C})$, then by [22, Theorem 3.3.3], upon noting that At is countable, $\mathfrak{C}$ has no complete representation, hence by the first item of theorem 4.2, $\mathfrak{C} \notin \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega$. So if $\mathbf{K}$ is between $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega$ and $\mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega$, then $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathbf{K}$, $\mathfrak{C} \notin \mathbf{K}$ and $\mathfrak{C} \equiv \mathfrak{B}$, thus $\mathbf{K}$ is not elementary, which is a contradiction since $\mathbf{El}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega (\subseteq \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega$ by assumption) is elementary. □

The range of $\mathbf{K}$ strictly between $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega$ and $\mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega$ is the 'critical range'. We know, by the second item of theorem 4.12 and first item of theorem 5.1, that the endpoints are not elementary, and we also know by the first item of theorem 5.1, that any class $\mathbf{L}$ between $\mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega$ and $\mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_{n+3}$ is not elementary. However, we do not know whether $\mathbf{K}_1$ and $\mathbf{K}_2$ defined in the item (7) of the previous theorem 6.5, proved in this last theorem to lie in this critical range, are elementary or not. If our assumption in the previous theorem is correct, then $\mathbf{K}_2 = \mathbf{El}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega$ would be elementary. This assumption does not tell anything about $\mathbf{K}_1$ as far as elementarity is concerned. But, on the other hand, if there exists a countable atom structure At, such that $\exists$ has a winning strategy in $\mathbf{G}_k(\mathsf{At})$ for all $k \in \omega$, and $\forall$ has a winning strategy in $G_\omega(\mathsf{At})$, then $\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At} \notin \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega \supseteq \mathbf{K}_1 \cup \mathbf{K}_2$, but $\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At} \in \mathbf{El}(\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega \cap \mathsf{CRCA}_n) = \mathbf{El}\mathbf{K}_1 \subseteq \mathbf{El}\mathbf{K}_2$, implying that both $\mathbf{K}_1$ and $\mathbf{K}_2$ are not elmentary.

Theorem 6.7. *Let $2 < n < \omega$. Then the following inclusions hold:*

$$\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}^{\mathsf{ad}}_\omega \cap \mathsf{At} \subset \mathbf{El}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}^{\mathsf{ad}}_\omega \cap \mathsf{At} \subset \mathbf{El}\mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}^{\mathsf{ad}}_\omega \cap \mathsf{At} = \mathsf{LK}_n = \mathbf{El}\mathsf{CRK}_n \subset \mathsf{SRK}_\mathsf{n}$$

$$\subset \mathbf{Up}\mathsf{SRK}_\mathsf{n} = \mathbf{Ur}\mathsf{SRK}_\mathsf{n} = \mathbf{El}\mathsf{SRK}_n \subset [\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega \cap \mathsf{At}]^{\mathsf{ad}}.$$

Proof. It is known [19, Proposition 2.90] that $\mathbf{Up}\mathsf{SRK}_\mathsf{n} = \mathbf{Ur}\mathsf{SRK}_\mathsf{n} = \mathbf{El}\mathsf{SRK}_n$. The algebras in SRK_n are atomic and completely additive by definition. Complete additivity of an operator on an atomic BAO is a first order property. Thus $\mathbf{El}\mathsf{SRK}_\mathsf{n}$ is contained in $[\mathsf{RK}_\mathsf{n} \cap \mathsf{At}]^{\mathsf{ad}}$.

The first and second strict inclusions follow from items (2) and (1), respectively, of theorem 4.12. The atomic $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathbf{El}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega$ given in the second item of theorem 4.12 described fully in last item of theorem 5.1, is outside $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega$, and the atomic $\mathfrak{B}$ in the first item of the same theorem, is in $\mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}^{\mathsf{ad}}_\omega \subseteq \mathbf{El}\mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}^{\mathsf{ad}}_\omega$, but is not in $\mathbf{El}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega \supseteq \mathbf{El}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}^{\mathsf{ad}}_\omega$. Now we turn to strictness of the remaining two inclusions. Since $\mathsf{LK}_\mathsf{n} \subseteq \mathsf{SRK}_\mathsf{n}$, the first is elementary by definition, the second is not, hence the strictness of the last inclusion in the first line, and the first one in the second line.

To prove the strictness of the last inclusion, namely, $\mathbf{El}\mathsf{SRK}_n \subset [\mathsf{RK}_\mathsf{n} \cap \mathsf{At}]^{\mathsf{ad}}$, take ω–many disjoint copies of the n element graph with nodes $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ and edges $0 \to 1$, $1 \to 2$, and $\ldots n-1 \to n$. Then of course $\chi(\mathfrak{G}) < \infty$. Now $\mathfrak{G}$ has an $n-1$ first order definable colouring. Since $\mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{G})$ with atom structure $\rho(\mathfrak{G})$, as defined in [22, Definition 3.6.3, pp. 77-78] and modified above to the other cylindric–like algebras approached here, is not representable, then the first order subalgebra $\mathfrak{F}(\mathfrak{G})$ in the sense of [19, pp.456 item (3)] is also not representable, because $\mathfrak{G}$ is first order interpretable in $\rho(\mathfrak{G})$. Here $\mathfrak{F}(\mathfrak{G})$ is the subalgebra of $\mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{G})$ consisting of all sets of atoms in $\rho(\mathfrak{G})$ of the form $\{a \in \rho(\mathfrak{G})\} : \rho(\mathfrak{G}) \models \phi(a, \bar{b})\} (\in \mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{G}))$ for some first order formula $\phi(x, \bar{y})$ of the signature of $\rho(\mathfrak{G})$ and some tuple $\bar{b}$ of atoms. It is easy to check that $\mathfrak{F}(\mathfrak{G})$ is indeed a subalgebra of $\mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{G})$, and that $\mathfrak{Tm}(\rho(\mathfrak{G})) \subseteq \mathfrak{F}(\mathfrak{G}) \subseteq \mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{G})$.

But $\mathfrak{F}(\mathfrak{G})$ is strictly larger than the term algebra. Indeed, the term algebra as a PEA_n can be shown to be representable, by an argument similar to that used in [26], witness too [19, pp.485,

Exercise 14.2(8)]. We readily conclude that $\rho(\mathfrak{G}) \notin \mathsf{At}\mathbf{El}\mathsf{SRK}_n$ but $\rho(\mathfrak{G}) \in \mathsf{At}(\mathsf{RK}_\mathsf{n}^\mathsf{ad})$, so $\mathbf{El}\mathsf{SRK}_\mathsf{n} \neq [\mathsf{RK}_\mathsf{n} \cap \mathsf{At}]^\mathsf{ad}$.

Now we consider the equalities in the first line. The second is straightforward. The first equality is also fairly straightforward, but we give a proof. If $\mathfrak{A}$ is in $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega^\mathsf{ad} \cap \mathsf{At}$, then by lemma 3.6, $\exists$ has a winning strategy in $F^\omega(\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A})$, hence in $G_\omega(\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A})$, and so obviously in $G_k(\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A})$ for all $k \in \omega$, so $\mathfrak{A}$ satisfies the Lyndon conditions. We have shown that $\mathbf{L} \subseteq \mathsf{LK}_\mathsf{n}$. The latter is elementary, so $\mathbf{El}\mathbf{L} \subseteq \mathsf{LK}_\mathsf{n}$.

Conversely, if $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{LK}_\mathsf{n}$, then $\exists$ has a winning strategy in $G_k(\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A})$ for all $k \in \omega$, so using ultrapowers followed by an elementary chain argument, we get a countable $\mathfrak{B}$, such that $\exists$ has a winning strategy in $G_\omega(\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{B})$, hence by [22, Theorem 3.3.3], we get that $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathsf{CRK}_\mathsf{n}$, and $\mathfrak{B} \equiv \mathfrak{A}$. By theorem 4.2, there is an atomic (dilation) $\mathfrak{D} \in \mathsf{K}_\omega^\mathsf{ad}$, such that $\mathfrak{B} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D}$, hence, we get using the notation in theorem 4.2, that $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega^\mathsf{atc}$, so $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathbf{El}\mathbf{S}_\mathbf{c}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega^\mathsf{atc} \subseteq \mathbf{El}\mathbf{S}_\mathbf{c}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega^\mathsf{ad} \cap \mathsf{At}$, and we are done.

□

Our next theorem is conditional. We need to fix and recall some notation. Let $2 < n < \omega$. For a relation algebra atom structure α, $\beta = \mathsf{Mat}_\mathsf{n}(\alpha)$ denotes the set of all basic n–dimensional matrices on α. Sometimes β is a n–dimensional cylindric basis [19, Definition 12.35]. This means that β is the atom–structure of a CA_n with accessibility relations corresponding to the cylindric operations defined as in [19, Definition 12.17], so that $\mathfrak{Cm}(\beta) \in \mathsf{CA}_n$.

We refer the reader to [8, Definition 3.1] for the exact definition of an *n–blur* (J, E) for a relation algebra R. In particular, $J \subseteq \wp(\mathsf{AtR})$ and $E \subseteq {}^3\omega$. $(J5)_n$ is the stronger condition obtained from $(J4)_n$ in [8, Definition 3.1] by replacing $\exists T$ by $\forall T$. We say that write (J, E) is a *strong n–blur* for R If the condition $(J4)_n$ in the definition of an n–blur is replaced by $(J5)_n$.

Theorem 6.8. *Let $2 < m < n < \omega$. Assume that there exists a finite integral relation algebra $\mathsf{R} \notin \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Ra}\mathsf{CA}_{\mathsf{n}+1}$ that has a strong n–blur (J, E). Let At be the infinite atom structure obtained by blowing up and blurring R, in the sense of [8, p.72]. Then $\mathsf{Mat}_\mathsf{n}(\mathsf{At})$ is an n–dimensional cylindric basis, and there exist cylindric algebras $\mathfrak{C}_m$ and $\mathfrak{C}_n$ in RCA_m and RCA_n, respectively, such that $\mathfrak{Tm}\mathsf{Mat}_\mathsf{m}(\mathsf{At}) \subseteq \mathfrak{C}_\mathsf{m}$ and $\mathfrak{Tm}\mathsf{Mat}_\mathsf{n}(\mathsf{At}) \subseteq \mathfrak{C}_\mathsf{n}$, $\mathfrak{C}_m = \mathfrak{Nr}_m\mathfrak{C}_n$ $\mathfrak{C}m\mathfrak{C}_m \notin \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_m\mathsf{CA}_{n+1}$.[4] Furthermore, if R is generated by a single element, then it can be fixed that both $\mathfrak{C}_m$ and $\mathfrak{C}_n$ are also generated by a single 2 dimensional element and that $\mathfrak{Tm}\mathsf{At} = \mathfrak{Ra}\mathfrak{C}_m = \mathfrak{Ra}\mathfrak{C}_n$.*

Sketch. We give a sketch of proof. We use the flexible construction in [8]. The details skipped can be easily recovered from [8]. The proof is like that in [8] by blowing up and blurring R instead of blowing up and blurring the 'Maddux algebra $\mathfrak{M}$' defined on p.84 [8, Theorems 1.2, 3.2, lemmas 4.3, 5.1]. The algebra $\mathfrak{M}$ will be used below in the proof of theorem 7.7.

One starts with the finite relation algebra R. Then this algebra is blown up and blurred. It is blown up by splitting the atoms each to infinitely many. It is blurred by using a finite set of blurs or colours, call this set of blurs J. This is expressed consicely by the product $\mathsf{At} = \omega \times (\mathsf{AtR} \sim \{\mathsf{Id}\}) \times J$, which will define an infinite atom structure of a new relation algebra $\mathcal{R}$; the term algebra on At. One can view such a product as a ternary matrix with ω rows, and fixing $n \in \omega$, one gets the rectangle $\mathsf{AtR} \times J$. Then two partitions are defined on At, call them P_1 and P_2. Composition is defined on this new infinite atom structure; it is induced by the composition in R, and a tenary relation E on ω, that synchronizes which three rectangles sitting on the i, j, k E–related rows compose like the original algebra R. This relation is definable in the first order structure $(\omega, <)$.

[4] In fact, we have $\mathfrak{Rd}_{sc}\mathfrak{Cm}\mathfrak{C}_m \notin \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_m\mathsf{Sc}_{n+1}$.

The first partition P_1 is used to show that R embeds in the complex algebra of this new atom structure, so the complex algebra cannot be in $S\mathfrak{Ra}\mathsf{CA}_{n+1}$.

The second partition P_2 divides At into ω sided finitely many rectangles, each with base $W \in J$, and the universe of the algebra $\mathcal{R}$ having atom structure At, are the sets that intersect co-finitely with every member of this partition. On the level of the term algebra R is blurred, so that the embedding of the small algebra into the complex algebra via taking infinite joins, do not exist in $\mathcal{R}$, for only finite and co-finite joins exist in this algebra.

$\mathcal{R}$ can be represented using the finite number of blurs. These correspond to non-principal ultrafilters in the Boolean reduct, which are necessary to represent this term algebra, for the principal ultrafilter alone would give a complete representation, hence a representation of the complex algebra, and this is impossible. Thereby, in particular, an atom structure that is weakly representable but not strongly representable is obtained. In fact this representation gives a complete representation of the canonical extension of $\mathcal{R}$.

Because (J, E) is an n–blur, the set of n basic matrices on At is an n-dimensional cylindric basis [8, Item(iii), Theorem 3.2] and so the n–dimensional basic matrices form an atom structure of a $\mathfrak{D} \in \mathsf{CA}_n$ that is also only weakly representable (not strongly representable). Because (J, E) is strong n–blur, the required algebra $\mathfrak{C}_n$, as defined in [8, Lemma 4.3], denoted by $\mathsf{Bb}_n(\mathsf{R}, J, E)$ is an algebra that lies between $\mathfrak{D}$ and $\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{D}$, $\mathfrak{C}_n \neq \mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{D}$ and $\mathfrak{C}_n$ has atom structure $\mathsf{Mat}_n(\mathcal{R})$.

Now (J, E) is a strong m–blur, too (since $m < n$) it can be shown, as in [8, Theorem 4.4], that the algebra $\mathfrak{C}_m = \mathsf{Bl}_m(\mathsf{R}, J, E)$, having atom structure $\mathsf{Mat}_\mathsf{m}(\mathsf{At}\mathcal{R})$ (same $\mathcal{R}$) is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{Nr}_m\mathfrak{C}_n$. First an embedding $h : \mathfrak{Rd}_m\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{Mat}_n(\mathsf{AtR}) \to \mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{Mat}_m(\mathsf{AtR})$ via $x \mapsto \{M \restriction m : M \in x\}$ is defined and it is shown that $h \restriction \mathfrak{Nr}_m\mathfrak{C}_n$ is an isomorphism onto $\mathfrak{C}_m$ [8, p.80].

Though $\mathfrak{C}_m \in \mathsf{RCA}_m \cap \mathfrak{Nr}_m\mathsf{CA}_n$, the complex algebra $\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{C}_m$ is not in $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_m\mathsf{CA}_{n+1}$, because $\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}(\mathcal{R}) \notin \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Ra}\mathsf{CA}_{n+1}$, since R embeds into $\mathfrak{C}m(\mathsf{At}\mathcal{R})$, $\mathsf{R} \notin \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Ra}\mathsf{CA}_{n+1}$ and $\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}\mathcal{R}$ embeds into $\mathfrak{Ra}\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{C}_m$. To make the algebra one generated this entails using infinitely many tenary relations [8, pp. 84-86]. ∎

Remark 6.9. If there exists a finite R with m-blur and $\mathsf{R} \notin \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Ra}\mathsf{CA}_{m+2}$, then $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_m\mathsf{CA}_{m+2}$ will not be atom–canonical. For in this case, we will have $\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}\mathcal{R} \notin \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Ra}\mathsf{CA}_{m+2}$, $\mathfrak{Tm}(\mathsf{Mat}_m(\mathsf{At}\mathcal{R})) \in \mathsf{RCA}_m$, but its Dedekind–MacNeille completion, namely, $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{C}m(\mathsf{Mat}_m(\mathsf{At}\mathcal{R}))$ is outside $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_m\mathsf{CA}_{m+2}$ because R embeds into $\mathfrak{Ra}\mathfrak{C}$.

Our next theorem provides, like the previous theorem, but in a totally different way, weakly representable atom structures that are not strongly representable for both CA_ns $(2 < n < \omega)$ and RAs in one go.

The result was proved in [26], where only the second graph in the following proof was used (ω disjoint union of N cliques, $N \geq n(n-1)/n$, where n is finite dimension > 2). Here we give another new graph that gives the same result. The reason we give a sketchy proof, besides introducing the new graph, is its model–theoretic affinity to the proof of item (2) of main theorem, and it will give the us opportunity to compare Monk-like constructions to rainbow ones. Though the model theory involved in both proofs are almost identical, the algebraic differences to be stressed upon in the next subsection are subtle, real and highly significant. Also the construction used by enlarging N getting infinitely many graphs with increasing chromatic number, gives another flexible construction (like that used in theorem 6.8), based on bad graphs having finite chromatic number, converging to a good one having infinite chromatic number.

Using ultraproducts of weakly representable algebras based on such bad graphs, and the construction in theorem 6.8 applied to the algebra $\mathfrak{M}$ (which is the way it appeared in [8]), by varying the parameter of non-identity atoms in $\mathfrak{M}$ (like done with N), letting it grow without bound, we

will prove the upcoming corollary 6.11 on non-finite axiomatizability of various classes of representable algebras of finite dimension > 2.

Theorem 6.10. *Let $2 < n < \omega$. Then there exists an atomic countable relation algebra R, such that $\mathsf{Mat}_n(\mathsf{AtR})$ forms an n–dimensional cylindric basis, $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{Tm}\mathsf{Mat}_n(\mathsf{AtR}) \in \mathsf{RCA}_\mathsf{n}$, while even the diagonal free reduct of the Dedekind–MacNeille completion of $\mathfrak{A}$, namely, $\mathfrak{Cm}\mathsf{Mat}_\mathsf{n}(\mathsf{AtR})$ is not representable. In particular, $\mathsf{Mat}_n(\mathsf{AtR})$ is a weakly, but not strongly representable CA_n atom structure.*

Proof. Fix a finite $n > 2$ (the dimension). Let $\mathfrak{G}$ be a graph. Let ρ be a 'shade of red'; we assume that $\rho \notin \mathfrak{G}$. Let L^+ be the signature consisting of the binary relation symbols (a, i), for each $a \in \mathfrak{G} \cup \{\rho\}$ and $i < n$. Let T denote the following (Monk) theory in this signature: $M \models T$ iff for all $a, b \in M$, there is a unique $p \in (\mathfrak{G} \cup \{\rho\}) \times n$, such that $(a, b) \in p$ and if $M \models (a, i)(x, y) \wedge (b, j)(y, z) \wedge (c, k)(x, z)$, $x, y, z \in M$, then $|\{i, j, k\} > 1$, or $a, b, c \in \mathfrak{G}$ and $\{a, b, c\}$ has at least one edge of $\mathfrak{G}_l$, or exactly one of a, b, c – say, a – is ρ, and bc is an edge of $\mathfrak{G}$, or two or more of a, b, c are ρ. We denote the class of models of T which can be seen as coloured undirected graphs (not necessarily complete) with labels coming from $(\mathfrak{G} \cup \{\rho\}) \times n$ by $\mathcal{G}$. Now specify $\mathfrak{G}$ to be either:

- the graph with nodes $\mathbb{N}$ and edge relation E defined by $(i, j) \in E$ if $0 < |i - j| < N$, where $N \geq n(n-1)/2$ is a positive number.
- or the ω disjoint union of N cliques, same N.

Then there is a countable (n–homogeneous) coloured graph (model) $M \in \mathcal{G}$ with the following property [24, Proposition 2.6]:

If $\triangle \subseteq \triangle' \in \mathcal{G}$, $|\triangle'| \leq n$, and $\theta : \triangle \to M$ is an embedding, then θ extends to an embedding $\theta' : \triangle' \to M$.

To construct such an M, we use a simple game [24, 26]. There are ω rounds. Let $\Gamma \in \mathcal{G}$ be the graph constructed up to a point in the game after finitely many rounds. The starting point can be taken to be the empty graph. $\forall$ chooses $\triangle \in \mathcal{G}$ of size $< n$, and an embedding $\theta : \triangle \to \Gamma$. He then chooses an extension $\triangle \subseteq \triangle^+ \in \mathcal{G}$, where $|\triangle^+ \backslash \triangle| \leq 1$. $\exists$ must respond with an extension $\Gamma \subseteq \Gamma^+ \in \mathcal{G}$ such that θ extends to an embedding $\theta^+ : \triangle^+ \to \Gamma^+$.

We may assume that Δ is not empty, $\Delta \neq \Delta^+$, and that $\forall$ played $(\Gamma \restriction F, Id_F, \triangle^+)$; $F = \mathsf{rng}(\theta)$ where $\Gamma \restriction F \subseteq \triangle^+ \in \mathcal{G}$, $\triangle^+ \backslash F = \{\delta\}$, and $\delta \notin \Gamma$, $\forall$'s move builds a labelled graph $\Gamma^* \supseteq \Gamma$, whose nodes are those of Γ together with δ, and whose edges are the edges of Γ together with edges from δ to every node of F.

Now $\exists$ must extend Γ^* to a complete graph on the same nodes and complete the colouring yielding a graph $\Gamma^+ \in \mathcal{G}$.

She plays as follows: The set of colours of the labels in $\{\triangle^+(\delta, \phi) : \phi \in F\}$ has cardinality at most $n-1$. Let $i < n$ be a "colour" not in this set. $\exists$ labels (δ, β) by (ρ, i) for every $\beta \in \Gamma \backslash F$. This completes the definition of Γ^+. It remains to check that this strategy works–that the conditions from the definition of $\mathcal{G}$ are met.

For this, it is sufficient to note that, if $\phi \in F$ and $\beta \in \Gamma \backslash F$, then the labels in Γ^+ on the edges of the triangle (β, δ, ϕ) are not all of the same colour (by choice of i) and if $\beta, \gamma \in \Gamma \backslash F$, then two the labels in Γ^+ on the edges of the triangle (β, γ, δ) are (ρ, i).

For an $L^n_{\infty\omega}$-formula φ, define φ^W to be the set $\{\bar{a} \in W : M \models_W \varphi(\bar{a})\}$.

Let $\mathfrak{A}$ be the relativized set algebra with domain $\{\varphi^W : \varphi \in L_n\}$ and unit W, endowed with the algebraic operations $\mathsf{d}_{ij}, \mathsf{c}_i$, etc., in the standard way, and formulas are taken in L. Let $\mathcal{S}$ be

the polyadic set algebra with domain $\wp({}^nM)$ and unit ${}^nM$. Then the map $h : \mathfrak{A} \longrightarrow S$ given by $h : \varphi^W \longmapsto \{\bar{a} \in {}^nM : M \models \varphi(\bar{a})\}$ can be checked to be well - defined and one-one. It clearly respects the polyadic operations, also because relativized semantics and classical semantics coincide on L_n formulas in the given signature, this is a representation of $\mathfrak{A}$. This follows from the fact that, like in the proof of item (2) of theorem 5.1, any permutation χ of $\omega \cup \{\rho\}$, Θ^χ is an n-back-and-forth system on M. Here Θ^χ is the set of partial one-to-one maps from M to M of size at most n that are χ-isomorphisms on their domains [26].

We make the above paragraph more precise. Let χ be a permutation of the set $\omega \cup \{\rho\}$. Let $\Gamma, \triangle \in \mathcal{G}$ have the same size, and let $\theta : \Gamma \to \triangle$ be a bijection. We say that θ is a *χ-isomorphism* from Γ to $\triangle$, cf. [24, Definitions, 3.8– 3.9], if for each distinct $x, y \in \Gamma$, if $\Gamma(x, y) = (a, j)$ with $a \in \mathbb{N}$, if $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 \leq r < a$ are the unique natural numbers (obtained by deviding a by N) such that $a = Nl + r$, then

$$\triangle(\theta(x), \theta(y)) = \begin{cases} (N\chi(i) + r, j), & \text{if } \chi(i) \neq \rho \\ (\rho, j), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

If $\Gamma(x, y) = (\rho, j)$, then

$$\triangle(\theta(x), \theta(y)) \in \begin{cases} \{(N\chi(\rho) + s, j) : 0 \leq s < N\}, & \text{if } \chi(\rho) \neq \rho \\ \{(\rho, j)\}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We now have for any permutation χ of $\omega \cup \{\rho\}$, Θ^χ is the set of partial one-to-one maps from M to M of size at most n that are χ-isomorphisms on their domains. We write Θ for $\Theta^{Id_{\omega \cup \{\rho\}}}$.

We claim that for any any permutation χ of $\omega \cup \{\rho\}$, Θ^χ is an n-back-and-forth system on M. Clearly, Θ^χ is closed under restrictions. We check the "forth" property. To see why, let $\theta \in \Theta^\chi$ have size $t < n$. We use an argument similar to that used [24, Theorem 3.10].

Enumerate $\mathsf{dom}(\theta)$, $\mathsf{rng}(\theta)$, respectively as $\{a_0, \ldots, a_{t-1}\}$, $\{b_0, \ldots, b_{t-1}\}$, with $\theta(a_i) = b_i$ for $i < t$. Let $a_t \in M$ be arbitrary, let $b_t \notin M$ be a new element, and define a complete labelled graph $\triangle \supseteq M \restriction \{b_0, \ldots, b_{t-1}\}$ with nodes $\{b_0, \ldots, b_t\}$ as follows.

Choose distinct "nodes"$e_s < N$ for each $s < t$, such that no (e_s, j) labels any edge in $M \restriction \{b_0, \ldots, b_{t-1}\}$. This is possible because $N \geq n(n-1)/2$, which bounds the number of edges in $\triangle$. We can now define the colour of edges (b_s, b_t) of $\triangle$ for $s = 0, \ldots, t-1$. If $M(a_s, a_t) = (Ni + r, j)$, for some $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 \leq r < N$, then

$$\triangle(b_s, b_t) = \begin{cases} (N\chi(i) + r, j), & \text{if } \chi(i) \neq \rho \\ \{(\rho, j)\}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

If $M(a_s, a_t) = (\rho, j)$, then assuming that $e_s = Ni + r$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 \leq r < N$,

$$\triangle(b_s, b_t) = \begin{cases} (N\chi(\rho) + r, j), & \text{if } \chi(\rho) \neq \rho \\ \{(\rho, j)\}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This completes the definition of $\triangle$. It is easy to check that $\triangle \in \mathcal{G}$. Hence, there is a graph embedding $\phi : \triangle \to M$ extending the map $Id_{\{b_0, \ldots, b_{t-1}\}}$. Note that $\phi(b_t) \notin \mathsf{rng}(\theta)$. So the map $\theta^+ = \theta \cup \{(a_t, \phi(b_t))\}$ is injective, and it is easily seen to be a χ-isomorphism in Θ^χ and defined on a_t. The converse,"back" property is similarly proved (or by symmetry, using the fact that the inverse of maps in Θ are χ^{-1}-isomorphisms).

The logics L_n and $L^n_{\infty\omega}$ are taken in the above signature. Let W is simply the set of tuples $\bar{a}$ in ${}^nM$ such that the edges between the elements of $\bar{a}$ don't have a label involving ρ (these are $(\rho, i) : i < n$). Their labels are all of the form $(Ni + r, j)$. We can now show that the classical and W-relativized semantics agree in the sense that $M \models_W \varphi(\bar{a})$ iff $M \models \varphi(\bar{a})$, for all $\bar{a} \in W$. The proof is by induction on φ.

We prove the hard direction [24, Proposition 3.13]. Suppose that $M \models_W \exists x_i \varphi(\bar{a})$. Then there is $\bar{b} \in {}^nM$ with $\bar{b} =_i \bar{a}$ and $M \models \varphi(\bar{b})$. Take $L_{\varphi,\bar{b}}$ to be any finite subsignature of L containing all the symbols from L that occur in φ or as a label in $M \restriction \mathsf{rng}(\bar{b})$. (Here we use the fact that φ is first-order. The result may fail for infinitary formulas with infinite signature.) Choose a permutation χ of $\omega \cup \{\rho\}$ fixing any i' such that some $(Ni' + r, j)$ occurs in $L_{\varphi,\bar{b}}$ for some $r < N$, and moving ρ.

Let $\theta = Id_{\{a_m : m \neq i\}}$. Take any distinct $l, m \in n \setminus \{i\}$. If $M(a_l, a_m) = (Ni' + r, j)$, then $M(b_l, b_m) = (Ni' + r, j)$ because $\bar{a} =_i \bar{b}$, so $(Ni' + r, j) \in L_{\varphi,\bar{b}}$ by definition of $L_{\varphi,\bar{b}}$. So, $\chi(i') = i'$ by definition of χ. Also, $M(a_l, a_m) \neq (\rho, j)(\text{any } j)$ because $\bar{a} \in W$. It now follows that θ is a χ-isomorphism on its domain, so that $\theta \in \Theta^\chi$. Extend θ to $\theta' \in \Theta^\chi$ defined on b_i, using the "forth" property of Θ^χ. Let $\bar{c} = \theta'(\bar{b})$. Now by choice of of χ, no labels on edges of the subgraph of M with domain $\mathsf{rng}(\bar{c})$ involve ρ. Hence, $\bar{c} \in W$.

Moreover, each map in Θ^χ is evidently a partial isomorphism of the reduct of M to the signature $L_{\varphi,\bar{b}}$. Now φ is an $L_{\varphi,\bar{b}}$-formula. We have $M \models \varphi(\bar{a})$ iff $M \models \varphi(\bar{c})$. So $M \models \varphi(\bar{c})$. Inductively, $M \models_W \varphi(\bar{c})$. Since $\bar{c} =_i \bar{a}$, we have $M \models_W \exists x_i \varphi(\bar{a})$ by definition of the relativized semantics. This completes the induction.

Define $\mathfrak{C}$ to be the complex algebra over $\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$, the atom structure of $\mathfrak{A}$. Then $\mathfrak{C}$ is the completion of $\mathfrak{A}$. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be the relativized set algebra with domain $\{\phi^W : \phi \text{ an } L^n_{\infty\omega} \text{ formula }\}$, unit W and operations defined like those of $\mathfrak{A}$. Then we have $\mathfrak{C} \cong \mathfrak{D}$, via the map $X \mapsto \bigcup X$ [24, Lemma 5.3].

Consider the following relation algebra atom structure $\alpha(\mathfrak{G}) = (\{\mathsf{Id}\} \cup (\mathfrak{G} \times n), R_{\mathsf{Id}}, \breve{R}, R_;)$, where:

The only identity atom is Id. All atoms are self converse, so $\breve{R} = \{(a, a) : a \text{ an atom }\}$. The colour of an atom $(a, i) \in \mathfrak{G} \times n$ is i. The identity Id has no colour. A triple (a, b, c) of atoms in $\alpha(\mathfrak{G})$ is consistent if $R;(a, b, c)$ holds ($R;$ is the accessibility relation corresponding to composition). Then the consistent triples are (a, b, c) where:

- one of a, b, c is Id and the other two are equal, or
- none of a, b, c is Id and they do not all have the same colour, or
- $a = (a', i), b = (b', i)$ and $c = (c', i)$ for some $i < n$ and $a', b', c' \in \mathfrak{G}$, and there exists at least one graph edge of G in $\{a', b', c'\}$.

$\mathfrak{C}$ is not representable because $\mathfrak{C}m(\alpha(\mathfrak{G}))$ is not representable and $\mathsf{Mat}_n(\alpha(\mathfrak{G})) \cong \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$. To see why, for each $m \in \mathsf{Mat}_n(\alpha(\mathfrak{G}))$, let $\alpha_m = \bigwedge_{i,j<n} \alpha_{ij}$. Here α_{ij} is $x_i = x_j$ if $m_{ij} = \mathsf{Id}$ and $R(x_i, x_j)$ otherwise, where $R = m_{ij} \in L$. Then the map $(m \mapsto \alpha^W_m)_{m \in \mathsf{Mat}_n(\alpha(\mathfrak{G}))}$ is a well - defined isomorphism of n-dimensional cylindric algebra atom structures. Non-representability follows from the fact that $\mathfrak{G}$ is a bad graph, that is, $\chi(\mathfrak{G}) = N < \infty$ [19, Definition 14.10, Theorem 14.11]. The relation algebra atom structure specified above is exactly like the one in Definition 14.10 in *op.cit*, except that we have n colours rather than just three, and thats precisely why the set n–dimensional basic matrices forms an n–dimensional cylindric basis, so we could lift the result from RAs to cylindric algebras of any finite dimension > 2. However, the proof progressed the other way

round, starting with a CA_n constructed model-theoretically, and then defining the relation algebra atom structure. But in any case, we obtained our result for both CA_ns $(2 < n < \omega)$ and RAs in one go.

□

Let $2 < n < \omega$. The n–dimensional $\mathfrak{A}_m$s used in the last item of theorem 4.12 witnessing non -finite axiomatizability of $\mathbf{ElK}$ for any $\mathbf{K}$, such that $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}_\omega \subseteq \mathbf{K} \subseteq \mathsf{RK_n}$ are finite and not representable, hence they are completely additive, atomic and outside $\mathbf{El}\mathsf{SRK_n} \supseteq \mathsf{LK}_n$. Furthermore any non-trivial ultraproduct of such algebras is also atomic and completely addtive (the last two properties together are first order definable hence preserved under taking ultraproducts), and is in $\mathbf{El}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{K}^{\mathsf{ad}}_\omega \cap \mathsf{At} \subseteq \mathsf{LK}_n$. This shows that both $\mathbf{El}\mathsf{SRK_n}$ and LK_n are not finitely axiomatizable. Here we re-prove the last result for $\mathsf{LK_n}$ but we restrict our attension to CA_n.

Let LCRA be the elementary class of relation algebras satsfying the Lyndon conditions. We now use the constructions in the previous two theorems 6.8 and 6.10 to prove the next theorem. We give two proofs. In each we use bad Monk–like algebras converging to a good one, and in the process, we recover Monk's classical results on non-finite axiomatizability of both $\mathsf{RCA_n}$ $(2 < n < \omega)$, and representable relation algbras (RRA).

Corollary 6.11. *Let $2 < n < \omega$. Then LCRA and $\mathsf{LCA_n}$ are not finitely axiomatizable.*

Proof. **First proof:** Our first proof addresses only RAs and CA_3. It can be lifted to CA_n for finite $n > 3$, by using the methods in [8]. Here we use a simple version of the construction in [8]. Let $l \geq 2$. Let I be a set such $\omega > |I| \geq 3l$ if l is finite, and $|I| = |l|$ otherwise. I will be the set of non-identity atoms of the blown up and blurred relation algebra when I is finite. Let $J = \{(X : X \subseteq I, |X| = l\}$. This is a generalization of the set of 3-complex blurs as defined in [8, Definition 3.1(ii)] allowing infinite l. Let $H = \{a_i^{P,W} : i \in \omega, P \in I, W \in J\}$. When I is finite, this is denoted by At in [8, p. 73] which is the notation we used in the above sketch. In all cases, including infinite l, it will give rise to an infinite atom structure of a relation algebra $\mathfrak{F}$ whose underlying set is $H \cup Id$ as follows: Define the tenary relation E on ω as follows:

$$E(i,j,k) \iff (\exists p,q,r)(\{p,q,r\} = \{i,j,k\} \text{ and } r - q = q - p).$$

This is a concrete instance of an *index blur* as defined in [8, Definition 3.1(iii)]. Together (J, E) is an 3–blur but *not* a strong 3–blur. Now we specify the consistent triples: (a, b, c) is consistent $\iff$ one of a, b, c is Id and the other two are equal, or $a = a_i^{P,S,p}, b = a_j^{Q,Z,q}, c = a_k^{R,W,r}$ where either $S \cap Z \cap W = \emptyset$ or both $e(i,j,k)$ and $|\{P,Q,R\}| \neq 1$ (we are avoiding mononchromatic triangles). That is if for $W \in J$, $E^W = \{a_i^{P,W} : i \in \omega, P \in W\}$, then

$$a_i^{P,S}; a_j^{Q,Z} = \bigcup\{E^W : S \cap Z \cap W = \emptyset\} \bigcup \{a_k^{R,W} : E(i,j,k), |\{P,Q,R\}| \neq 1\}.$$

When I is finite, the two partitions P_1 and P_2 respectively are defined as follows: For $P \in I$, let $H^P = \{a_i^{P,W} : i \in \omega, W \in J, P \in W\}$. Then

$$P_1 = \{H^P : P \in I\}, \;\; P_2 = \{E^W : W \in J\}.$$

Pending on l and I, call these atom structures $\mathcal{F}(l, I)$. When $l < \omega$, then $\mathcal{C}m\mathcal{F}(l, 3l)$ is not representable, because in this case one can embed the finite relation algebra $\mathfrak{E}_I(2, 3)$ with non-identity atoms $I = 3l$ into $\mathfrak{C}m\mathcal{F}(l, 3l)$. Indeed, the composition in $\mathfrak{C}m\mathcal{F}(l, 3l)$ is defined such that its restriction on the first partition satisfies:

$$H^P; H^Q = \bigcup\{H^Z : |\{Z, P; Q\}| \neq 1\} = \bigcup\{H^Z : Z \leq P; Q \text{ in } \mathfrak{M}\}.$$

Now non-representability of $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{C}m\mathcal{F}(l, 3l)$ follows from the fact that $\mathfrak{E}(2, 3)$ can be represented, if at all, only on finite sets, which is not the case with $\mathfrak{C}$ since it is infinite. The universe of $\mathcal{R}_l = \mathfrak{Tm}\mathcal{F}(l, 3l)$ is the following set:

$$R_l = \{X \subseteq F : X \cap E^W \in \mathsf{Cof}(E^W), \text{ for all } W \in J\}.$$

The algebra $\mathcal{R}_l$, which we denote simply by $\mathcal{R}$ as we did in the above sketch, is representable. For any $a \in H$ and $W \in J$, set $U^a = \{X \in R : a \in X\}$ and $U^W = \{X \in R : |X \cap E^W| \geq \omega\}$. Then the principal ultrafilters of $\mathcal{R}$ are exactly U^a, $a \in H$ and U^W are non-principal ultrafilters for $W \in J$ when E^W is infinite. Let $J' = \{W \in J : |E^W| \geq \omega\}$, and let $\mathsf{Uf} = \{U^a : a \in F\} \cup \{U^W : W \in J'\}$. Uf is the set of ultrafilters of $\mathcal{R}$ which is used as colours to represent $\mathcal{R}$, witness [8, pp. 75-77].

Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a non- trivial ultraproduct of $\mathcal{F}(l, 3l)$, $l \in \omega$. Then $\mathcal{F}$ is a completely representable atom structure obtained by blowing up and blurring $\mathfrak{E}_\omega(2, 3)$. Here $\mathfrak{E}_\omega(2, 3)$ embeds into $\mathfrak{C}m(\mathcal{F})$, but now the former algebra is representable plainly on infinite sets as the base of the representation. This does not tell us that $\mathcal{F}$ is completely representable, but at least it does not contradict it. And indeed, it can be shown without much difficulty $\mathfrak{C}m(\mathcal{F})$ is actually completely representable. Here the set J of blurs is infinite and Uf as defined above would be a proper subset of the set of all ultrafilters of the term algebra.

Thus $\mathcal{R}_l = \mathfrak{Tm}\mathcal{F}(l, 3l)$ are RRA's without a complete representation with a completely representable ultraproduct, and $\mathfrak{C}m\mathcal{F}(l, 3l) = \mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}(\mathcal{R}_l)$, $l \in \omega$, are non–representable relation algebras, with a completely representable ultraproduct; since the last two ultraproducts have the same atom structure $\mathfrak{F}$. Since such algebras have 3–dimensional cylindric basis, we get the analogous result for LCA_3.

Second proof: Let $\mathfrak{A}_l$ be the atomic RCA_n constructed from $\mathfrak{G}_l$, $l \in \omega$ where $\mathfrak{G}_l$ has nodes $\mathbb{N}$ and edge relation E_l defined by $(i, j) \in E_l \iff 0 < |i - j| < N_l$, or a disjoint countable union of N cliques, such that for $i < j \in \omega$, $n(n-1)/n \leq N_i < N_j$. Then $\mathfrak{C}m\mathfrak{A}_l$ with $\mathfrak{A}_l$ based on $\mathfrak{G}_l$, as constructed in theorem 6.10 is not representable. So $(\mathfrak{C}m(\mathfrak{A}_l) : l \in \omega)$ is a sequence of non–representable algebras, whose ultraproduct $\mathfrak{B}$, being based on the ultraproduct of graphs having arbitrarily large chromatic number, will have an infinite clique, and so $\mathfrak{B}$ will be completely representable [22, Theorem 3.6.11]. Likewise, the sequence $(\mathfrak{Tm}(\mathfrak{A}_l) : l \in \omega)$ is a sequence of representable, but not completely representable algebras, whose ultraproduct is completey representable. The same holds for the sequence of relation algebras $(\mathsf{R}_l : l \in \omega)$ constructed as in the proof of theorem 6.10, for which $\mathfrak{Tm}\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}_l \cong \mathsf{Mat}_n\mathsf{At}\mathsf{R}_l$.

□

Remark 6.12. The model–theoretic ideas used in item (2) of theorem 5.1 and construction in the proof of theorem 6.10 are quite similar, in the overall structure; they follow closely the model-theoretic framework in [24].

In both cases, we have finitely many shades of red outside a Monk-like and rainbow signature, that were used as labels to construct an n– homogeneous model M in the expanded signature. Though the shades of reds are *outside* the signature, they were used as labels during an ω–rounded game played on labelled finite graphs–which can be seen as finite models in the extended signature having size $\leq n$– in which $\exists$ had a winning strategy, enabling her to construct the required M as a countable limit of the finite graphs played during the game. The construction, in both cases, entailed that any subgraph (substructure) of M of size $\leq n$, is independent of its location in M; it is uniquely determined by its isomorphism type.

A relativized set algebra $\mathfrak{A}$ based on M was constructed by discarding all assignments whose edges are labelled by these shades of reds, getting a set of n–ary sequences $W \subseteq {}^nM$. This W is

definable in ${}^nM$ by an $L_{\infty,\omega}$ formula and the semantics with respect to W coincides with classical Tarskian semantics (on ${}^nM$) for formulas of the signature taken in L_n (but not for formulas taken in $L^n_{\infty,\omega}$).

This was proved in both cases using certain n back–and–forth systems, thus $\mathfrak{A}$ is representable classically, in fact it (is isomorphic to a set algebra that) has base M. The *heart and soul* of the proof, is to replace the reds labels by suitable non–red binary relation symbols within an n back–and–forth system, so that one can adjust that the system maps a tuple $\bar{b} \in {}^nM \backslash W$ to a tuple $\bar{c} \in W$ and this will preserve any formula containing the non–red symbols that are 'moved' by the system. In fact, all injective maps of size $\leq n$ defined on M modulo an appropriate permutation of the reds will form an n back–and–forth system.

This set algebra $\mathfrak{A}$ will further be atomic, countable, and simple (with top element ${}^nM$). The subgraphs of size $\leq n$ of M whose edges are not labelled by any shade of red are the atoms of $\mathfrak{A}$, expressed syntactically by MCA formulas.

The Dedekind–MacNeille of $\mathfrak{A}$, namely, the complex algebra of its atom structures, in symbols $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$, has top element W, but it is not in $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_{n+3}$ in case of the rainbow construction, least representable, and it is not representable in the Monk-algebra case, so that it will be outside $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_{n+k}$ for some $k \geq 1$. But as opposed to the rainbow construction, we cannot tell from the Monk–like construction, based on a Monk-like first order theory stipulated above , what is the least such k. Nevertheless, in this last case, $\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$ turns out isomorphic to the atom structure consisting of n–basic matrices on a weakly, but not strongly representable, relation atom structure.

In case of both constructions 'the shades of red' – which can be intrinsically identified with non–principal ultrafilters in $\mathfrak{A}$, were used as colours, together with the principal ultrafilters to represent completely $\mathfrak{A}^+$, inducing a representation of $\mathfrak{A}$. Non–representability of $\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$ in the Monk case, used Ramsey's theory. The non neat–embeddability of $\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$ in the rainbow case, used *the finite number of greens* that gave us information on when $\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$ 'stops to be representable.' The reds in both cases has to do with representing $\mathfrak{A}$.

The model theory used for both constructions is almost identical. Nevertheless, from the algebraic point of view, there is a crucial difference between the Monk–like algebras used above and the rainbow algebra used in item (2) of theorem 5.1. The non–representability of $\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$ can be tested by a game between the two players $\forall$ and $\exists$. In the rainbow algebra winning strategy's of the two players are independent, this is reflected by the fact that we have two 'independent parameters' G (the greens) and R (the reds). In Monk–like algebras winning strategy's are interlinked, one operates through the other; hence only one parameter is the source of colours, namely, the graph $\mathfrak{G}$. Representability of the complex algebra in this case depends only on the chromatic number of $\mathfrak{G}$, via an application of Ramseys' theorem.

In both cases two players operate using 'cardinality of a labelled graph'. $\forall$ trying to make this graph too large for $\exists$ to cope, colouring some of its edges suitably. For the rainbow case, it is a red clique formed during the play. It might be clear in both cases (rainbow and Monk–like algebras), to see that $\exists$ cannot win the infinite game, but what might not be clear is *when does this happens; we know it eventually happen in finitely many round, but till which round* $\exists$ *has not lost yet.*

In rainbow constructions, one can contol this by varying the green parameter of the construction in [24] as we did truncating the number of greens to be $n+1$. The structures G and R, having any relative strength gives flexibility and more control over the rainbow game lifted from an Ehrenfeucht–Fraïssé forth–game on these structures. The number of pebbles used by $\forall$ in the graph game used, determines exactly when $\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$ 'stops to be representable'. This idea can be implemented semantically like Hodkinson's proof *excluding* $n+3$*–flat representability* or syntactically, via *a blow up and blur* construction. We chose the second approach, proving that for $2 < n < \omega$, the class

$\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_{n+k}$ is not atom canonical for any $k \geq 3$.

Now what if in the 'Monk construction' based on $\mathfrak{G}$, we have $\chi(\mathfrak{G}) = \infty$? for a graph $\mathfrak{G}$. Let us approach the problem abstractly. Let $\mathfrak{G}$ be a graph. One can define a family of first order structures (labelled graphs) in the signature $\mathfrak{G} \times n$, denote it by $I(\mathfrak{G})$ as follows: For all $a, b \in M$, there is a unique $p \in \mathfrak{G} \times n$, such that $(a, b) \in p$. If $M \models (a, i)(x, y) \wedge (b, j)(y, z) \wedge (c, l)(x, z)$, then $|\{i, j, l\} > 1$, or $a, b, c \in \mathfrak{G}$ and $\{a, b, c\}$ has at least one edge of $\mathfrak{G}$. For any graph Γ, let $\rho(\Gamma)$ be the atom structure defined from the class of models satisfying the above, these are maps from $n \to M$, $M \in I(\mathfrak{G})$, endowed with an obvious equivalence relation, with cylindrifiers and diagonal elements defined as Hirsch and Hodkinson define atom structures from classes of models, and let $\mathfrak{M}(\Gamma)$ be the complex algebra of this atom structure.

We define a relation algebra atom structure $\alpha(\mathfrak{G})$ as above. Then the relation algebra to have an n–dimensional cylindric basis and, in fact, the atom structure of $\mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{G})$ is isomorphic (as a cylindric algebra atom structure) to the atom structure Mat_n of all n-dimensional basic matrices over the relation algebra atom structure $\alpha(\mathfrak{G})$. It is plausible that one can prove that $\alpha(\mathfrak{G})$ is strongly representable $\iff$ $\mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{G})$ is representable $\iff$ $\mathfrak{G}$ has infinite chromatic number, so that one gets the result, that the class of strongly represenatble algebras for both RAs and CAs of finite dimension at least three, is not elementary in one go.

The underlying idea here is that shade of red ρ will appear in the *ultrafilter extension* of $\mathfrak{G}$, if it has infinite chromatic number, as a reflexive node [22, Definition 3.6.5] and its n–copies (ρ, i), $i < n$, can be used to completely represent $\mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{G})^+$.

7 Omitting types

Algebraic logic is most effective and attractive when it has non-trivial repercussions on (first order) logic. Indeed, this section is the climax of the two parts of the paper, where the progression of the previously proved results culminate. We apply the algebraic results obtained so far, to various omitting types theorems for variants of first order logic.

We formulate our results only for CAs to economize on space. The other cases can be dealt with exactly in the same way. Recall that L_n denotes first order logic restricted to the first n variables.

Henceforth, because we deal with CAs only, we deviate from our earlier notation for several subclasses of CAs, that was introduced earlier differently, to deal with all cases uniformly, always referring to K. For example we denoted the class of dimension complemented algebras in K_α, α an infinite ordinal, by DKc_α. Here we denote this class for CA_αs by the common more familiar notation adopted in [15], namely, by Dc_α. By the same token, for an ordinal α, restricting our attention to CAs, Cs_α, Ws_α Gs_α, Gws_α, and Lf_α denote the classes of set algebras, weak set algebras, generalized set algebras, generalized weak set algebras, and locally finite algebras, of dimension α, respectively. For $\alpha < \omega$, $\mathsf{Cs}_\alpha = \mathsf{Ws}_\alpha$, $\mathsf{Gs}_\alpha = \mathsf{Gws}_\alpha$ and $\mathsf{Lf}_\alpha = \mathsf{CA}_\alpha$. We should also keep in mind that for every ordinal α, we have $\mathsf{RCA}_\alpha = \mathbf{I}\mathsf{Gs}_\alpha = \mathbf{I}\mathsf{Gws}_\alpha$.

We start with an algebraic lemma implied by the results obtained in the first two items of theorem 5.1, but it implies neither.

Lemma 7.1. *Let $2 < n < \omega$. Then there exists an atomic countable RCA_n that does not have a complete infinitary $n + 3$–flat representation. In fact, there exists such an algebra, that is further simple, and does not have a complete $n + 3$–square representation.*

Proof. We first consider infinitary $n+3$–flatness. Consider the term algebra $\mathfrak{E}$ of the CA reduct of

$\mathsf{PEA}_{\mathbb{Z},\mathbb{N}}$ used in the first item of theorem 5.1, and the CA reduct of the algebra $\mathfrak{A}$ used in second item of the same theorem, which we continue to denote by $\mathfrak{A}$, each is of dimension n.

Such algebra are are countable and atomic; $\mathfrak{A}$ is simple. They have no complete infinitary $n+3$–flat representations. Indeed, if $\mathfrak{E}$ has an infinitary $n+3$–flat complete representation, then it would be, by lemma 3.5 in $\mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_{n+3}$, which means that $\mathfrak{Rd}_{ca}\mathsf{PEA}_{\mathbb{Z},\mathbb{N}}$ is also in $\mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_{n+3}$ (for they share the same atom structure) which is impossible. By the same token, if $\mathfrak{A}$ has a complete infinitary $n+3$–flat representation M, this would induce an infinitary $n+3$–flat representation of $\mathfrak{Rd}_{ca}\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}$. This implies by the same item in the same lemma that $\mathfrak{Rd}_{ca}\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A} \in \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_{n+3}$, which is also impossible.

We now show that $\mathfrak{A}$ does not have a complete $n+3$–square representation. An $n+3$–square representation of $\mathfrak{A}$ will imply, by lemma 3.6, that $\exists$ has a winning strategy in $G_\omega^{n+3}(\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A})$, which is impossible because by item (2) of theorem 5.1 $\forall$ has a winning strategy in this game. □

Let T be an L_n theory in a signature L. An L–formula α is called an *atom*, if α is consistent with T and for every L–formula ψ, one of $\psi \to \alpha$ or $\psi \to \neg\alpha$ is valid. A *co–atom* is the negation of an atom. T is *atomic*, if for every L–formula ϕ consistent with T, there is an atom α, such that $T \models \alpha \to \phi$,

A set of L–formulas Γ consistent with T is *principal*, if there exists a formula α that is consistent with T, such that $T \models \alpha \to \beta$ for all $\beta \in \Gamma$. Otherwise, it is *non–principal*.

$\mathfrak{Fm}_T$ denotes the Tarski–Lindenbaum algebra obtained by factoring out the set of formulas Fm by the congruence relation $\phi \sim \psi \iff T \models \phi \leftrightarrow \psi$. Then it is easy to see that

$$T \text{ is atomic} \iff \mathfrak{Fm}_T \text{ has an atomic Boolean reduct.}$$

Let $2 < n < m \leq \omega$. From now on we deal with $\mathfrak{Fm}_T \in \mathsf{RCA}_n$ when T is complete in a signature L, so that $\mathfrak{Fm}_T$ is simple. We say that M is an m–relativized model of T, if there exist an embedding $f : \mathfrak{Fm}_T \to \wp(1^M)$, equivalently M is a relativized m– representation of $\mathfrak{Fm}_T$.

Definition 7.2. Let $2 < n < \omega$, let $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{RCA}_n$ be simple, and $X \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$. Then an m–relativized model M of $\mathfrak{A}$ omits X, if there exists an embedding $f : \mathfrak{A} \to \wp(1^M)$ such that $\bigcap f(x) = \emptyset$. If T is a complete L_n theory and Γ is a set of formulas, then Γ is omitted in an m–relativized model M of T if M omits $\{\phi_T : \phi \in \Gamma\} (\subseteq \mathfrak{Fm}_T)$.

Theorem 7.3. *Let $2 < n < \omega$. Then there is a countable, atomic, complete and consistent L_n theory T, such that the non–principal type consisting of co–atoms cannot be omitted in an $n+3$–square model,*

Proof. We focus on $\mathfrak{A}$ as in the second item of theorem 5.1. We can identify $\mathfrak{A}$ with $\mathfrak{Fm}_T$ for some countable and consistent theory T using n variables, and because $\mathfrak{A}$ is atomic, T is an atomic theory.

Let $\Gamma = \{\neg\phi : \phi_T \in \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{Fm}_{m,T}\}$. Then it is easy to see, because T is atomic, that Γ is a non–principal type. But Γ cannot be omitted in an $n+3$–*square* model for such a model necessarily gives a complete $n+3$–square representation of $\mathfrak{A}$, which contradicts the previous lemma. Hence Γ cannot be omitted in any m–square model, for $n \leq m \leq \omega$.

The same conclusion holds for uncountable m, for in this case we have M is a complete m–square representation of $\mathfrak{A} \iff M$ is an ω–square complete representation of $\mathfrak{A} \iff M$ is a complete representation of $\mathfrak{A}$, because $\mathfrak{A}$ is countable, and we know that $\mathfrak{A}$ has no complete representation.

Since $\mathfrak{A}$ is simple, then T is also complete, thus T and Γ are as required. □

We remind the reader of (the contrapositive of) the usual omitting types theorem: If T is a countable consistent first order theory, and Γ is an m, $(m < \omega)$ type, that is, a set of formulas having at most m free variables, that is realized in every model of T, then Γ is *isolated by a formula*, in the sense that, there exists a formula α consistent with T such that $T \models \alpha \to \beta$ for all $\beta \in \Gamma$. We call α a k witness, $1 \leq k < \omega$, if it uses k variables.

Theorem 7.4. *(1) Let $n > 3$ be finite. Assume that there exists a finite relation algebra R as in the statement of theorem 6.8 but with the weaker condition of existence of n–blur. In particular, $\mathsf{R} \notin \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Ra}\mathsf{CA}_{n+1}$. Then for any $2 < m < n$, there is an L_m atomic theory T in a signature with only one binary relation, and a non–principal type Γ using only three variables and one free variable, such that Γ cannot be omitted in an $n+1$–flat model.*

(2) If, in addition, R has a strong n-blur, then there is an atomic L_m theory T, and a type Γ as above, such that Γ is realizble in every $n+1$–flat model, but any formula isolating Γ has to contain more than n variables.

Proof. We prove the theorem without the refinements imposed on the type Γ and the language having only one binary relation. Such conditions can be easily obtained from what we prove using exactly the techniques in [27, Theorem 3.3.1] and [8].

For the first part $\mathcal{R}$, obtained by blowing up and blurring R as in the proof of theorem 6.8, will be representable and $\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}\mathcal{R} \notin \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Ra}\mathsf{CA}_{n+1}$, because R embeds into $\mathfrak{C}m(\mathsf{At}\mathsf{R})$, and by assumption $\mathsf{R} \notin \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Ra}\mathsf{CA}_{n+1}$. By n–blurness, and $m < n$, $\mathcal{R}$ will have an m–dimensional cylindric basis, and $\mathfrak{Tm}\mathsf{Mat}_m(\mathsf{At}\mathcal{R}) \in \mathsf{RCA}_m$ will have no complete n–flat representation.

This is so, because $\mathfrak{C}m(\mathsf{At}(\mathcal{R}))$ embeds into it $\mathfrak{C}m(\mathfrak{Tm}(\mathsf{Mat}_m(\mathsf{At}\mathcal{R}))$ and $\mathfrak{C}m(\mathsf{At}\mathcal{R}) \notin \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Ra}\mathsf{CA}_{n+1}$ so that $\mathfrak{C}m(\mathsf{Mat}_n\mathsf{At}\mathcal{R})) \notin \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_m\mathsf{CA}_{n+1}$. As in the proof of lemma 7.1, a complete $n+1$–flat representation for $\mathfrak{Tm}\mathsf{Mat}_n(\mathsf{At}\mathcal{R})$ induces an $n+1$–flat representation of $\mathfrak{C}m(\mathfrak{Tm}(\mathsf{Mat}_n\mathsf{At}\mathcal{R}))$. The rest follows from the first item of lemma 3.5 and the reasoning in theorem 7.3 replacing $\mathfrak{A}$ by the also countable term algebra $\mathfrak{Tm}(\mathsf{Mat}_n\mathsf{At}\mathcal{R})$ and square by flat.

For the second part, by strong n–blurness one gets, exactly like in the sketch of proof of theorem 6.8, a countable $\mathfrak{C}_m \in \mathsf{RCA}_\mathsf{m} \cap \mathfrak{Nr}_\mathsf{m}\mathsf{CA}_\mathsf{n}$, such that $\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{C}_m \notin \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_m\mathsf{CA}_{n+1}$. In more detail, using the notation in the sketch given above, the Dedekind–MacNeille completion of $\mathcal{R}$ obtained by blowing up and blurring R is outside $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Ra}\mathsf{CA}_{n+1}$, $\mathsf{Mat}_\mathsf{n}(\mathsf{At}\mathcal{R})$ is an n–dimensional cylindric basis, since R has an n–blur (J, E), and this n–blur is strong, hence there exists $\mathfrak{C}_n = \mathsf{Bb}_n(\mathsf{R}, J, E) \in \mathsf{CA}_n$ such that $\mathfrak{Tm}\mathsf{Mat}_\mathsf{n}(\mathsf{At}\mathcal{R}) \subseteq \mathfrak{C}_\mathsf{n} \neq \mathfrak{Cm}\mathsf{Mat}_\mathsf{n}(\mathsf{At}\mathcal{R})$, and finally because (J, R) is a strong m–blur, as well, then $\mathfrak{C}_m = \mathsf{Bb}_m(\mathsf{R}, J, E) \cong \mathfrak{Nr}_m\mathfrak{C}_n$ is in $\mathsf{RCA}_\mathsf{m} \cap \mathfrak{Nr}_\mathsf{m}\mathsf{CA}_\mathsf{n}$. But $\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{C}_m \notin \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Nr}_m\mathsf{CA}_{n+1}$, because $\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}\mathcal{R}$ embeds into the $\mathfrak{Ra}$ reduct of $\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{C}_m$, R embeds into $\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}\mathcal{R}$, and by assumption $\mathsf{R} \notin \mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Ra}\mathsf{CA}_{n+1}$.

The L_m theory T corresponding to $\mathfrak{C}_m$, and the non–principal type Γ corresponding to its co–atoms, as defined in the proof of theorem 7.3 are as required, witness [27, Theorem 3.3.1]. We give more details:

For brevity, let $\mathfrak{A}$ be $\mathfrak{C}_m$ as described above. Let Γ' be the set of atoms of $\mathfrak{A}$. We can and will assume that $\mathfrak{A}$ is simple (this is proved in [8]). Then $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{Fm}_T$ for some countable consistent theory T using m variables and and so T is atomic. Let $\Gamma = \{\phi : \phi_T \in \Gamma'\}$. Then we claim that Γ is realized in each $n+1$ flat model of T. Indeed, consider such an $n+1$ model M of T. Let $V \subseteq {}^nM$ be such that $\bigcup_{s \in V} \mathsf{rng}(s) = M$. For a formula ϕ let ϕ_c^M be the set of assignments in V that satisfy ϕ in the clique guarded sematics, that is $\phi_c^M = \{s \in V : M, s \models_c \phi\}$. If Γ is not realized in M, then this gives an $n+1$ complete flat representation of $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{Fm}_T$, defined via $\phi_T \mapsto \phi_c^M$, since $\bigcup_{\phi \in \Gamma} \phi_c^M = 1^M = V$.

For the second part concerning sensitivity of witnesses to the number of variables used. Suppose for contradiction that ϕ is a formula in the signature L, consistent with T, using n variables, such that $T \models \phi \to \alpha$, for all $\alpha \in \Gamma$. Then $\mathfrak{A}$ is simple, and so we can assume without loss of generality, that it is (isomorphic to) a set algebra with base M, say. Let M be the corresponding standard model (in a relational signature) to this set algebra in the sense of [15, section 4.3]. Let ϕ^M denote the set of all assignments classically satisfying ϕ in M. We have $M \models T$ and $\phi^M \in \mathfrak{A}$, because $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathfrak{Nr}_m\mathsf{CA}_n$.

But $T \models \exists \bar{x}\phi$, hence $\phi^M \neq 0$, from which it follows that ϕ^M must intersect an atom $\alpha \in \mathfrak{A}$, since the latter is atomic. Let ψ be the formula, such that $\psi^M = \alpha$. Then it cannot be the case that $T \models \phi \to \neg\psi$, hence ϕ is not an n–witness, and we are done.

□

Question: Does R in the first item exist? This is necessary for R in the second item to exist. Candidates for such relation algebras can be found in [9] or [19, Definition 15.2], but it seems that they need some modifications to fit the bill.

The above theorem does not work for infinite n, because in this case $\mathfrak{C}_m \in \mathfrak{Nr}_m\mathsf{CA}_\omega$ which means, by theorem 4.2, since $\mathfrak{C}_m$ is countable and atomic, that it is completely representable. This induces a representation of $\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{C}_m$, which is impossible, because we know that $\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{C}_m$ is not strongly representable. In other words, for $2 < m \leq k \leq \omega$ and $m \in \omega$, there is a countable, atomic, simple $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{RCA_m} \cap \mathfrak{Nr_m}\mathsf{CA_{m+k}}$ that is not completely representable $\iff k < \omega$.

One strategy to circumvent negative results (like non–finite axiomatizability) in algebraic logic is to pass to 'nice expansions' of the class in question. Biro [4] showed that for $2 < n < \omega$, expanding $\mathsf{RCA_n}$ with finitely many *first order definable operations*, to be defined next, does not conquer non–finite axiomatizability. Thus L_n enriched with the corresponding first order definable connectives is still severely incomplete (as long as these connectives are finite) relative to any finite Hilbert–style axiomatization.

We show next that such expansions do not conquer failure of omitting types, as well. First order definable expansions of finite variable fragments of first order logic was initiated by Jonsson [5] in the context of relation algebras, and were further studied by Bíro, Givant, Németi, Tarski, Sági and others [4, 7, 1], and naturally extrapolated to L_n [7]. Our approach in what follows is mostly algebraic.

Definition 7.5. Let $2 < n < \omega$. Let $\mathsf{Cs}_{n,t}$ denote the following class of signature t:

(i) t is an expansion of the signature of CA_n.

(ii) $\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{Rd}_{ca}\mathsf{Cs}_{n,t} = \mathsf{Cs}_n$. In particular, every algebra in $\mathsf{Cs}_{n,t}$ is a Boolean field of sets with unit ${}^nU$ say, that is closed under cylindrifications and contains diagonal elements.

(iii) For any m-ary operation f of t, there exists a first order formula ϕ with free variables among the first n and having exactly m, n–ary relation symbols $R_0, \ldots, R_{m-1}$, such that, for any set algebra $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{Cs}_{n,t}$ with base M, $X_0, \ldots, X_{m-1} \in \mathfrak{A}$, and $s \in {}^nM$ we have: $s \in f(X_0, \ldots, X_{m-1}) \iff \langle M, X_0, \ldots, X_{m-1}\rangle \models \phi[s]$. Here R_i is interpreted as X_i, and $\models$ is the usual satisfiability relation.

(iv) With f and ϕ as above, f is said to be *a first order definable operation with ϕ defining f*, or simply a first order definable operation, and $\mathsf{Cs}_{n,t}$ is said to be a *first order definable expansion* of Cs_n. (The defining ϕ is not unique.)

(v) $\mathsf{RCA}_{n,t}$ denotes the class $\mathbf{SPCs}_{n,t}$, i.e. the class of all subdirect products of algebras in $\mathsf{Cs}_{n,t}$. We also refer to $\mathsf{RCA}_{n,t}$ as a *first order definable expansion* of RCA_n.

Fix $2 < n < \omega$. Like $\mathsf{RCA_n}$, one can show that $\mathsf{RCA_{n,t}}$ is a discriminator variety (the discriminator terrm is $\mathsf{c}_{(n)}x$), that is not finitely axiomatizable, if the number of variables used in the first order definable operations is finite [4]. Let L_n^t be the corresponding (algebraizable) logic using n variables. This logic is obtained from L_n by adding connectives definable by the first order formulas used to define the operations in t.

A famous theorem of Vaught's for first order logic says that an atomic countable theory has an atomic countable model. Now restricting Vaught's theorem to (the algebraic counterpart of) L_n^t, it takes the following form, which we denote by VT:

Definition 7.6. Let everything be as in the last item of the previous definition. Then $\mathsf{RCA}_{n,t}$ has VT, if whenever $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{RCA}_{n,t}$ is simple, countable, and atomic, there exists $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathsf{Cs}_{n,t}$ with base M say, and an isomorphism $f : \mathfrak{A} \to \mathfrak{B}$ such that $\bigcup_{x \in \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}} f(x) = {}^nM$.

Notice that in theorem 7.3, we have actually showed that VT fails if we consider atomic $n+3$–square relativized models, when $n > 2$ is finite. In what follows OTT abbreviates 'omitting types theorem'. The result in the following theorem is mentioned without proof on [8, p.87]:

Theorem 7.7. *Let $2 < n < \omega$. Let $\mathsf{RCA_{n,t}}$ be a first order definable expansion of $\mathsf{RCA_n}$. If the operations in t are first order definable by formulas using only finitely many $k > n$ variables, then $\mathsf{RCA_{n,t}}$ does not have VT. In particular, OTT fails for L_n^t.*

Proof. Let $2 < n < \omega$. Let $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{RCA}_n \cap \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_{k+1}$ be simple and countable, with no complete representation. Such an algebra exists [8]. Indeed, like in [8, Lemma 5.1], take $l \geq 2(k+1)-1$, $m \geq (2(k+1)-1)l$, $m \in \omega$, and take R in theorem 6.8 to be the finite integral relation algebra $\mathfrak{E}_m(2,3)$, where m is the number of non-identity atoms in $\mathfrak{E}_m(2,3)$, and compostion in the latter algebra is defined by allowing all triangles except monochromatic ones [8, p.83]. This finite relation algebras has a strong $k+1$–blur, hence using the notation in theorem 6.8, we have $\mathfrak{A} = \mathsf{Bb}_n(\mathfrak{E}_m(2,3), J, E))$ with atom structure $\mathsf{Mat}_n(\mathsf{At}\mathcal{R})$, where $\mathcal{R}$ is the representable relation algebra obtained by blowing up and blurring $\mathfrak{E}_m(2,3)$, is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{Bb}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{E}_m(2,3), J, E)$, where $\mathsf{Bb}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{E}_m(2,3), J, E)$ has atom structure $\mathsf{Mat}_{k+1}(\mathsf{At}\mathcal{R})$. Furthermore, $\mathfrak{A}$ is not strongly representable, that is $\mathfrak{C}m\mathsf{Mat}_n(\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{E}_m(2,3))$ is not representable, so it cannot be completely representable.

Now to simplify notation, we let $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{B}$ with $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathsf{CA}_{k+1}$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that we have only one extra operation f definable by a first order restricted formula ϕ, say, using $n < k < \omega$ variables with at most n free variables. Now ϕ defines a CA_k term $\tau(\phi)$ which, in turn, defines the unary operation f on $\mathfrak{A}$, via $f(a) = \tau(\phi)^{\mathfrak{B}}(a)$. This is well defined, in the sense that $f(a) \in \mathfrak{A}$, because $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_{k+1}$ and the first order formula ϕ defining f has at most n free variables.

Call the expanded algebra $\mathfrak{A}^*$. Then $\mathfrak{A}^* \in \mathsf{RCA_{n,t}}$ and is still simple. For if J is a proper ideal of $\mathfrak{A}^*$, then J is a Boolean ideal and for $a \in A$, and $i < n$, if $a \in J$, then $\mathsf{c_i}a \in J$, so that J is proper ideal of $\mathfrak{A}$, and this cannot be, because $\mathfrak{A}$ is simple. Obviously $\mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A} = \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}^*$. Now assume for contradiction that $\mathfrak{A}^*$ has VT. Then there exists $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathsf{Cs}_{n,t}$ with base M, say, and an isomorphism $f : \mathfrak{A}^* \to \mathfrak{B}$ such that $\bigcup_{x \in \mathsf{At}\mathfrak{A}^*} f(x) = {}^nM$. But then $f' : \mathfrak{A} \to \mathfrak{Rd}_{ca}\mathfrak{B}$, defined via $a \mapsto f(a)$, is obviously an isomorphism (of the CA reducts), giving a complete representation of $\mathfrak{A}$. This is a contradiction and we are done. □

For the same reason stated after theorem 7.4 if t has (infinitely many) operations that use infinitely many variables, then it is possible that the omitting types hold for this (infinite) first order definable extension of L_n. For example if $k \geq n$, define the connective c_k by $\exists v_k R_0$. Adding c_k for all $n \leq k < \omega$, captures all first order definable formulas, in the sense that if t is the expanded signature and $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{RCA}_{\mathsf{n,t}}$ then $\mathfrak{Rd}_{ca}\mathfrak{A} \in \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega$.

To prove our next theorem we need a couple of lemmas:

Lemma 7.8. *Let $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B}$ be algebras having the same signature. Then the following two conditions are equivalent:*

(i) $h : \mathfrak{A} \to \mathfrak{B}$ is a homomorphism.

(ii) h is a subalgebra of $\mathfrak{A} \times \mathfrak{B}$ and h is a function with $\mathsf{dom}h = A$.

Proof. [15, Theorem 0.3.37]. □

We formulate the next lemma in a form more general than needed counting in infinite dimensions, because the proof is the same for all dimensions. The argument used is similar to [15, Theorem 5.3.15]; the latter theorem addresses relation algebras.

Lemma 7.9. *Let α be an arbitrary ordinal and let $\mathbf{K} = \{\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{CA}_{\alpha+\omega} : \mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{S}g^{\mathfrak{A}}\mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathfrak{A}\}$. Let $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B} \in \mathbf{K}$ and suppose that $f : \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathfrak{A} \to \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathfrak{B}$ is an isomorphism. Then there exists an embedding $g : \mathfrak{A} \to \mathfrak{B}$ such that $f \subseteq g$.*

Proof. Let $g = \mathfrak{S}g^{\mathfrak{A}\times\mathfrak{B}}f$. It suffices to show, by the previous lemma, that g is an injection with domain A. It obviously has co domain B. Now

$$\mathsf{dom}g = \mathsf{dom}\mathfrak{S}g^{\mathfrak{A}\times\mathfrak{B}}f = \mathfrak{S}g^{\mathfrak{A}}\mathsf{dom}f = \mathfrak{S}g^{\mathfrak{A}}\mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{A}.$$

Though $\mathsf{Dc}_{\alpha+\omega}$ may not be closed under finite direct products but $\mathbf{K}$ is for the following reasoning; assume that $\mathfrak{C}$, $\mathfrak{D} \in \mathbf{K}$, then we have $\mathfrak{S}g^{\mathfrak{C}\times\mathfrak{D}}\mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha(\mathfrak{C} \times \mathfrak{D}) = \mathfrak{S}g^{\mathfrak{C}\times\mathfrak{D}}(\mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathfrak{C} \times \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathfrak{D}) = \mathfrak{S}g^{\mathfrak{C}}\mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathfrak{C} \times \mathfrak{S}g^{\mathfrak{D}}\mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathfrak{D} = \mathfrak{C} \times \mathfrak{D}$.

By symmetry it is enough to show that g is a function. We first prove the following (*)

$$\text{If } (a, b) \in g \text{ and } \mathsf{c}_k(a, b) = (a, b) \text{ for all } k \in \alpha + \omega \sim \alpha, \text{ then } f(a) = b.$$

Towards this aim, we proceed as follows:

$$(a, b) \in \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathfrak{S}g^{\mathfrak{A}\times\mathfrak{B}}f = \mathfrak{S}g^{\mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha(\mathfrak{A}\times\mathfrak{B})}f = \mathfrak{S}g^{\mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathfrak{A}\times\mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathfrak{B}}f = f.$$

Here we are using that $\mathfrak{A} \times \mathfrak{B} \in \mathbf{K} \subseteq \mathsf{Dc}_{\alpha+\omega}$, so that $\mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathfrak{S}g^{\mathfrak{A}\times\mathfrak{B}}f = \mathfrak{S}g^{\mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha(\mathfrak{A}\times\mathfrak{B})}f$. In case α is finite $\mathfrak{A} \times \mathfrak{B}$ is locally finite.

Now suppose that $(x, y), (x, z) \in g$. Let $k \in \alpha + \omega \sim \alpha$. Let Δ denote symmetric difference. Then

$$(0, \mathsf{c}_k(y\Delta z)) = (\mathsf{c}_k 0, \mathsf{c}_k(y\Delta z)) = \mathsf{c}_k(0, y\Delta z) = \mathsf{c}_k((x, y)\Delta(x, z)) \in g.$$

Also,

$$\mathsf{c}_k(0, \mathsf{c}_k(y\Delta z)) = (0, \mathsf{c}_k(y\Delta z)).$$

Thus by (*) we have

$$f(0) = \mathsf{c}_k(y\Delta z), \text{ for any } k \in \alpha + \omega \sim \alpha.$$

Hence $\mathsf{c}_k(y\Delta z) = 0$ and so $y = z$. □

Let covK be the cardinal used in [27, Theorem 3.3.4]. The cardinal $\mathfrak{p}$ satisfies $\omega < \mathfrak{p} \leq 2^{\omega}$ and has the following property: If $\lambda < \mathfrak{p}$, and $(A_i : i < \lambda)$ is a family of meager subsets of a Polish space X (of which Stone spaces of countable Boolean algebras are examples) then $\bigcup_{i\in\lambda} A_i$ is meager. For the definition and required properties of $\mathfrak{p}$, witness [3, pp. 3, pp. 44-45, corollary 22c]. Both cardinals covK and $\mathfrak{p}$ have an extensive literature. It is consistent that $\omega < \mathfrak{p} < \mathsf{covK} \leq 2^{\omega}$ [3], so that the two cardinals are generally different, but it is also consistent that they are equal; equality holds for example in the Cohen real model of Solovay and Cohen. Martin's axiom implies that both cardinals are the continuum.

If α is any ordinal $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{RCA}_{\alpha}$ and $\mathbf{X} = (X_i : i < \lambda)$ is family of subsets of $\mathfrak{A}$, we say that $\mathbf{X}$ *is omitted in* $\mathfrak{C} \in \mathsf{Gws}_{\alpha}$, if there exists an isomorphism $f : \mathfrak{A} \to \mathfrak{C}$ such that $\bigcap f(X_i) = \emptyset$ for all $i < \lambda$. When we want to stress the role of f, we say that $\mathbf{X}$ is omitted in $\mathfrak{C}$ via f. If $X \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$ and $\prod X = 0$, then we may refer to X as a non-principal type of $\mathfrak{A}$.

Theorem 7.10. *Let $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_{\omega}$ be countable. Let $\lambda < 2^{\omega}$ and let $\mathbf{X} = (X_i : i < \lambda)$ be a family of non-principal types of $\mathfrak{A}$. Then the following hold:*

(1) If $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_{\omega}$, then $\mathbf{X}$ can be omitted in a Gs_{n},

(2) Every $< \mathfrak{p}$ subfamily of $\mathbf{X}$ can be omitted in a Gs_{n}; in particular, every countable subfamily of $\mathbf{X}$ can be omitted in a Gs_{n},

(3) If $\mathfrak{A}$ is simple, then every $< \mathsf{covK}$ subfamily of $\mathbf{X}$ can be omitted in a Cs_{n},

(4) It is consistent, but not provable (in ZFC), that $\mathbf{X}$ can be omitted in a Gs_{n},

(5) If $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_{\omega}$ and $|\mathbf{X}| < \mathfrak{p}$, then $\mathbf{X}$ can be omitted $\iff$ every countable subfamily of $\mathbf{X}$ can be omitted. If $\mathfrak{A}$ is simple, we can replace $\mathfrak{p}$ by covK.

(6) If $\mathfrak{A}$ is atomic, not necessarily countable, but have countably many atoms, then any family of non–principal types can be omitted in an atomic Gs_{n}; in particular, $\mathbf{X}$ can be omitted in an atomic Gs_{n}; if $\mathfrak{A}$ is simple, we can replace Gs_{n} by Cs_{n}.

Proof. (1) follows from theorem 7.12. For (2) and (3), we can assume that $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{B}$, $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathsf{Lf}_{\omega}$. We work in $\mathfrak{B}$. Using the notation on [27, p. 216 of proof of Theorem 3.3.4] replacing $\mathfrak{Fm}_T$ by $\mathfrak{B}$, we have $\mathbf{H} = \bigcup_{i\in\lambda}\bigcup_{\tau\in V}\mathbf{H}_{i,\tau}$ where $\lambda < \mathfrak{p}$, and V is the weak space ${}^{\omega}\omega^{(Id)}$, can be written as a countable union of nowhere dense sets, and so can the countable union $\mathbf{G} = \bigcup_{j\in\omega}\bigcup_{x\in\mathfrak{B}}\mathbf{G}_{j,x}$. So for any $a \neq 0$, there is an ultrafilter $F \in N_a \cap (S \sim \mathbf{H} \cup \mathbf{G})$ by the Baire's category theorem. This induces a homomorphism $f_a : \mathfrak{A} \to \mathfrak{C}_a$, $\mathfrak{C}_a \in \mathsf{Cs}_{\mathsf{n}}$ that omits the given types, such that $f_a(a) \neq 0$. (First one defines f with domain $\mathfrak{B}$ as on p.216, then restricts f to $\mathfrak{A}$ obtaining f_a the obvious way.) The map $g : \mathfrak{A} \to \mathbf{P}_{a\in\mathfrak{A}\sim\{0\}}\mathfrak{C}_a$ defined via $x \mapsto (g_a(x) : a \in \mathfrak{A} \sim \{0\})(x \in \mathfrak{A})$ is as required. In case $\mathfrak{A}$ is simple, then by properties of covK, $S \sim (\mathbf{H} \cup \mathbf{G})$ is non–empty, so if $F \in S \sim (\mathbf{H} \cup \mathbf{G})$, then F induces a non–zero homomorphism f with domain $\mathfrak{A}$ into a Cs_n omitting the given types. By simplicity of $\mathfrak{A}$, f is injective.

To prove independence, it suffices to show that covK many types may not be omitted because it is consistent that $\mathsf{covK} < 2^{\omega}$. Fix $2 < n < \omega$. Let T be a countable theory such that for this given n, in $S_n(T)$, the Stone space of n–types, the isolated points are not dense. It is not hard to find such theories. One such (simple) theory is the following:

Let $(R_i : i \in \omega)$ be a countable family of unary relations and for each disjoint and finite subsets $J, I \subseteq \omega$, let $\phi_{I,J}$ be the formula expressing 'there exists v such that $R_i(v)$ holds for all $i \in I$ and $\neg R_j(v)$ holds for all $j \in J$. Let T be the following countable theory $\{\phi_{I,J} : I, J \text{ as above }\}$. Using

a simple compactness argument one can show that T is consistent. Furthermore, for each $n \in \omega$, $S_n(T)$ does not have isolated types at all, hence of course the isolated types are not dense in $S_n(T)$ for all n. Algebraically, this means that if $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{Fm}_T$, then for all $n \in \omega$, $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{A}$ is atomless. Another example, is the theory of random graphs.

This condition excludes the existence of a prime model for T because T has a prime model $\iff$ the isolated points in $S_n(T)$ are dense for all n. A prime model which in this context is an atomic model, omits any family of non–principal types (see the proof of the last item). We do not want this to happen.

Using exactly the same argument in [2, Theorem 2.2(2)], one can construct a family P of non–principal 0–types (having no free variable) of T, such that $|P| = \mathsf{covK}$ and P cannot be omitted. Let $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{Fm}_T$ and for $p \in P$, let $X_p = \{\phi/T : \phi \in p\}$. Then $X_p \subseteq \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{A}$, and $\prod X_p = 0$, because $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{A}$ is a complete subalgebra of $\mathfrak{A}$.

Then we claim that for any $0 \neq a$, there is no set algebra $\mathfrak{C}$ with countable base and $g : \mathfrak{A} \to \mathfrak{C}$ such that $g(a) \neq 0$ and $\bigcap_{x \in X_p} f(x) = \emptyset$. To see why, let $\mathfrak{B} = \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{A}$. Let $a \neq 0$. Assume for contradiction, that there exists $f : \mathfrak{B} \to \mathfrak{D}'$, such that $f(a) \neq 0$ and $\bigcap_{x \in X_i} f(x) = \emptyset$. We can assume that B generates $\mathfrak{A}$ and that $\mathfrak{D}' = \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D}$, where $\mathfrak{D} \in \mathsf{Lf}_\omega$. Let $g = \mathfrak{S}g^{\mathfrak{A} \times \mathfrak{D}}f$. By lemma 7.9 g is a homomorphism with $\mathsf{dom}(g) = \mathfrak{A}$ and g omits P. This contradicts that P, by its construction, cannot be omitted. Assuming Martin's axiom, we get $\mathsf{covK} = \mathfrak{p} = 2^\omega$; together with the above arguments this proves (4).

We prove (5). Let $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{D}$, $\mathfrak{D} \in \mathsf{Lf}_\omega$ is countable. Let $\lambda < \mathfrak{p}$. Let $\mathbf{X} = (X_i : i < \lambda)$ be as in the hypothesis. Let T be the corresponding first order theory, so that $\mathfrak{D} \cong \mathfrak{Fm}_T$. Let $\mathbf{X}' = (\Gamma_i : i < \lambda)$ be the family of non–principal types in T corresponding to $\mathbf{X}$. If $\mathbf{X}'$ is not omitted, then there is a (countable) realizing tree for T, hence there is a realizing tree for a countable subfamily of $\mathbf{X}'$ in the sense of [2, Definition 3.1], hence a countable subfamily of $\mathbf{X}'$ cannot be omitted. Let $\mathbf{X}_\omega \subseteq \mathbf{X}$ be the corresponding countable subset of $\mathbf{X}$. Assume that $\mathbf{X}_\omega$ can be omitted in a Gs_n, via f say. Then again by lemma 7.9, f can be lifted (like above) to $\mathfrak{Fm}_T$ omitting $\mathbf{X}'$, which is a contradiction. We leave the part when $\mathfrak{A}$ is simple to the reader.

We finally prove (6): If $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathbf{S}_n\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega$, is atomic and has countably many atoms, then any complete representation of $\mathfrak{A}$, equivalently, an atomic representation of $\mathfrak{A}$, equivalently, a representation of $\mathfrak{A}$ omitting the set of co–atoms, which exists by theorem 4.2, is as required. If $\mathfrak{A}$ is simple and completely representable, then it is completely represented by a Cs_n. □

Using the reasoning in the first items in both theorems 4.2 and 7.10, the following omitting types theorem can now be easily proved. This theorem is stronger than the OTT proved in [27] because $\mathsf{Dc}_\alpha \subset \mathbf{S}_\mathsf{c}\mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathsf{CA}_{\alpha+\omega}$ and the strictness of the inclusion can be witnessed on countable algebras.

For example the cylindric reduct of the (countable) α-dimensional algebra $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathsf{RQEA}_\alpha$ (taking $\mathfrak{F} = \mathbb{Q}$, say) used in the first item of theorem 4.12 is in $\mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathsf{CA}_{\alpha+\omega}$, but it is not in Dc_α, because if $s \in {}^\alpha\mathbb{Q}^{(\mathbf{0})}$, and $x = \{s\} \in \mathfrak{B}$, then $\Delta x = \alpha$.

However, the proof is the same, for one works with a dimension complemented countable dilation $\mathfrak{D} \in \mathsf{Dc}_{\alpha+\omega}$ of $\mathfrak{A}$, as in the hypothesis, such that $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathfrak{D}$ and $\mathfrak{A}$ generates $\mathfrak{D}$. Then using [27, Theorem 3.2.4], one constructs a representation of $\mathfrak{D}$ omitting the given $< \mathfrak{p}$ (still) non–principal types (by the condition $\subseteq_c$); its restriction to $\mathfrak{A}$ the obvious way, gives the required representation omitting the $< \mathfrak{p}$ non-principal types of $\mathfrak{A}$.

Theorem 7.11. *Let α be a countable infinite ordinal. Let $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathsf{CA}_{\alpha+\omega}$ be countable. Let $\lambda < \mathfrak{p}$ be a cardinal, and let $\mathbf{X} = (X_i < \lambda)$ be a family of non-principal types of $\mathfrak{A}$. Then there*

exists $\mathfrak{C} \in \mathsf{Gws}_\alpha$ *that omits* $\mathbf{X}$ *via an embedding* $f : \mathfrak{A} \to \mathfrak{C}$. *If* $\mathfrak{A}$ *is simple, then* $< \mathsf{covK}$ *many non-principal types can be omitted.*

The last two items in theorem 5.1, tell us that for any ordinal $\alpha \geq \omega$, there are uncountable atomic RCA_αs that are not completely representable (by generalized weak set algebras); the last item constructs such an algebra $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha \mathsf{CA}_{\alpha+\omega} \subseteq \mathbf{S}_c \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha \mathsf{CA}_{\alpha+\omega}$. Using the usual argument, we get that the non–principal type consisting of co–atoms of $\mathfrak{A}$ cannot be omitted, hence the previous theorem 7.11 does not generalize to the uncountable case. But there is a missing (natural) part:

Question: Can we replace $\mathbf{S}_c$ by $\mathbf{S}$ in theorem 7.11? Perhaps a more tangible instance of the question would be: Is there a countable atomic $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathsf{RCA}_\omega$ that is *not* completely representable by generalized weak set algebras of dimension ω?
Although Hirsch and Hodkinson [18] showed that the class of completely representable RCA_ωs is *not* elementary, and even more they explicitly constructed a countable atomic $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathsf{RCA}_\omega$ with no complete representation, but *complete representability was excluded with respect to* $\mathsf{Gs}_\omega s$. In principal such a $\mathfrak{B}$ can be completely represented in a *relativized sense by a* Gws_ω. The proof in [18] that $\mathfrak{B}$ lacks a 'square' complete representation does not kill this possibility.

Our next theorem holds for any $L_n (2 < n < \omega)$ theory T, that has quantifier elimination [27, Theorem 3.3.10], because if T is such, then $\mathfrak{Fm}_T$ will be in $\mathfrak{Nr}_n \mathsf{CA}_\omega$.

The maximality condition stipulated in the hypothesis (in the next theorem) cannot be omitted, else if $\lambda = \omega$, we get an independent statement, witness [27, Theorem 3.2.8] and for $\lambda = 2^\omega$ we get a false one by the last item of theorem 5.1. To see why, note that if $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathfrak{Nr}_n \mathsf{CA}_\omega$ is atomic and has no complete representation ($\mathfrak{B}$ will necesarily have uncountably many atoms by theorem 4.2), then viewed as an uncountable L_n theory, the non–principal type consisting of co–atoms, formed as in the proof of theorem 7.3 *which cannot be a Boolean ultrafilter* as shown next, cannot be omitted. For any infinite cardinal κ, such a $\mathfrak{B}$ of cardinality 2^κ was given in the last item of theorem 5.1.

Theorem 7.12. *Assume that* $2 < n < \omega$, *that* $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathfrak{Nr}_n \mathsf{CA}_\omega$ *has cardinality* λ, λ *a regular cardinal, and that* $0 \neq a \in \mathfrak{A}$. *Let* $\kappa < 2^\lambda$, *and let* $\mathbf{G} = (F_i : i < \kappa)$ *be a system of non–principal ultrafilters of* $\mathfrak{A}$. *Then there exists a set algebra* $\mathfrak{C}$ *with base* U, *such that* $|U| \leq \lambda$, *and a homomorphism* $f : \mathfrak{A} \to \mathfrak{C}$, *such that* $f(a) \neq 0$ *and* $\bigcap f(F_i) = \emptyset$ *for each* $i < \lambda$.

Proof. The proof is a three folded restricted of a result of Shelah proved for uncountable first order theories. The first restriction is to the countable case, the second is to L_n theories, and the third is to L_n theories that have quantifier elimination:

Shelah [30] proved the following: Suppose that T is a first order theory, $|T| \leq \lambda$ and ϕ is a formula consistent with T, then there exist models $\mathfrak{M}_i : i < {}^\lambda 2$, each of cardinality λ, such that ϕ is satisfiable in each, and if $i(1) \neq i(2)$, $\bar{a}_{i(l)} \in M_{i(l)}$, $l = 1, 2,$, $\mathsf{tp}(\bar{a}_{l(1)}) = \mathsf{tp}(\bar{a}_{l(2)})$, then there are $p_i \subseteq \mathsf{tp}(\bar{a}_{l(i)})$, $|p_i| < \lambda$ and $p_i \vdash \mathsf{tp}(\bar{a}_{l(i)})$ ($\mathsf{tp}(\bar{a})$ denotes the complete type realized by the tuple $\bar{a}$) [30, Theorem 5.16, Chapter IV].

We consider only the case $\lambda = \omega$. Now assume that $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{Nr}_n \mathfrak{B}$, where $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathsf{Lf}_\omega$ is countable, and let $(F_i : i < \kappa)$ with $\kappa < 2^\omega$ be the given family of non–principal ultrafilters. Then we can assume that $\mathfrak{B} = \mathfrak{Fm}_T$ for some countable consistent theory T and that $a = \phi_T$ (ϕ a formula consistent with T). Let $\Gamma_i = \{\phi/T : \phi \in F_i\}$. Let $\mathbf{F} = (\Gamma_j : j < \kappa)$ be the corresponding set of types in T, they are non–principal and complete n–ary types in T.

Let $(\mathfrak{M}_i : i < 2^\omega)$ be the constructed set of countable models for T that overlap only on principal maximal types in which ϕ is satisfiable. We know that such models exist by Shelah's aforementioned result.

Assume for contradiction that for all $i < 2^\omega$, there exists $\Gamma \in \mathbf{F}$, such that Γ is realized in $\mathfrak{M}_i$. Let $\psi : 2^\omega \to \wp(\mathbf{F})$, be defined by $\psi(i) = \{F \in \mathbf{F} : F \text{ is realized in } \mathfrak{M}_i\}$. Then for all $i < 2^\omega$, $\psi(i) \neq \emptyset$. Furthermore, for $i \neq j$, $\psi(i) \cap \psi(j) = \emptyset$, for if $F \in \psi(i) \cap \psi(j)$ then it will be realized in $\mathfrak{M}_i$ and $\mathfrak{M}_j$, and so it will be principal.

This implies that $|\mathbf{F}| = 2^\omega$ which is impossible. Hence we obtain a model $\mathfrak{M} \models T$ omitting $\mathbf{F}$ in which ϕ is satisfiable. The map f defined from $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{Fm}_T$ to $\mathsf{Cs}_n^{\mathfrak{M}}$ (the set algebra based on $\mathfrak{M}$ [15, Definition 4.3.4]) via $\phi_T \mapsto \phi^{\mathfrak{M}}$, where the latter is the set of n–ary assignments in $\mathfrak{M}$ satisfying ϕ, omits $\mathbf{G}$. □

Question: Can we replace $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega$ by the larger $\mathbf{S}_c\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathsf{CA}_\omega$ in theorem 7.12?
The problem here is that if $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_c \mathfrak{Nr}_\alpha\mathfrak{B}$, $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathsf{Lf}_\omega$ and if F is a non–principal ultrafilter of $\mathfrak{A}$, then there is no guarantee that the filter generated by F in $\mathfrak{Nr}_n\mathfrak{B}$ remains maximal and non–principal. It can be neither.

References

[1] A. Tarski and S. Givant *A formalization of set theory without variables.* AMS Colloquium Publications **41**, (1987).

[2] E. Casanovas, R. Farre *Omitting types in incomplete theories*, Journal of Symbolic Logic, **61**(1)(1996), p. 236–245

[3] D.H. Fremlin *Consequences of Martin's axiom*. Cambridge University Press, 1984.

[4] B. Biró. *Non-finite axiomatizability results in algebraic logic.* Journal of Symbolic Logic, **57**(3)(1992), 832–843.

[5] B. Jonsson B, *The theory of binary relations*. In H. Andréka, J.D.Monk. and I. Németi, (editors) *Algebraic Logic.* North-Holland, Amsterdam, (1991)p .245–292.

[6] H. Andréka, M. Ferenczi and I. Németi, (Editors), **Cylindric-like Algebras and Algebraic Logic**, Bolyai Society Mathematical Studies and Springer-Verlag, **22** (2012).

[7] I. Németi, *Algebraization of quantifier logics, an introductory overview*. Math.Inst.Budapest, Preprint, No 13-1996. A shortened version appeared in Studia Logica **50**(1991),465–569.

[8] H. Andréka, I. Németi and T. Sayed Ahmed, *Omitting types for finite variable fragments and complete representations.* Journal of Symbolic Logic, **73** (2008) p. 65–89.

[9] R. Hirsch, I. Hodkinson, R. Maddux, *Relation algebra reducts of cylindric algebras and an application to proof theory,* Journal of Symbolic Logic **67**(1) (2002), p. 197–213.

[10] H. Andréka , S. Givant, S.Mikulas I. Németi I. and A. Simon , *Notions of density that imply representability in algebraic logic.* Annals of Pure and Applied logic, **91**(1998), p. 93–190.

[11] J. Bulian and I. Hodkinson *Bare canonicity of representable cylindric and polyadic algebras* Annals of Pure and Applied Logic, **164**(2013), p. 884–906.

[12] T. Sayed Ahmed *The class of completely representable polyadic algebras of infinite dimension is elementary* Algebra Universalis (in press).

[13] Sayed Ahmed, T. *Neat embeddings as adjoint situations.* Published on Line, Synthese. (2014) DOI 10.1007/s11229-013-0344-7.

[14] M. Ferenczi, *The polyadic generalization of the Boolean axiomatization of fields of sets.* Trans. of the Amer. Math. Society **364**(2) (2011), p. 867–886.

[15] L. Henkin, J.D. Monk and A. Tarski, *Cylindric Algebras Parts I and II.* North Holland, 1970, 1985.

[16] R. Hirsch, *Relation algebra reducts of cylindric algebras and complete representations.* Journal of Symbolic Logic, **72**(2) (2007), p.673–703.

[17] R. Hirsch *Corrigendum to 'Relation algebra reducts of cylindric algebras and complete representations'* Journal of Symbolic Logic, **78**(4) (2013) p. 1345–1348.

[18] R. Hirsch and I. Hodkinson *Complete representations in algebraic logic.* Journal of Symbolic Logic, **62**(3)(1997) p. 816–847.

[19] R. Hirsch and I. Hodkinson, *Relation Algebras by Games.* Studies In Logic. North Holland **147** (2002).

[20] Daigneault, A., and Monk,J.D., *Representation Theory for Polyadic algebras.* Fund. Math. **52**(1963) p.151-176.

[21]

[22] R. Hirsch and I. Hodkinson, *Completions and complete representations in algebraic logic.* In [6].

[23] R. Hirsch and T. Sayed Ahmed, *The neat embedding problem for algebras other than cylindric algebras and for infinite dimensions.* Journal of Symbolic Logic **79**(1) (2014) p.208–222.

[24] I. Hodkinson, *Atom structures of relation and cylindric algebras.* Annals of pure and applied logic, **89**(1997), p.117–148.

[25] I. Hodkinson, *A construction of cylindric and polyadic algebras from atomic relation algebras.* Algebra Universalis, **68** (2012), p. 257–285.

[26] T. Sayed Ahmed, *Weakly representable atom structures that are not strongly representable, with an application to first order logic,* Mathematical Logic Quarterly, **54**(3)(2008) p. 294–306

[27] T. Sayed Ahmed *Completions, complete representations and omitting types.* In [6].

[28] T. Sayed Ahmed, *Neat reducts and neat embeddings in cylindric algebras.* In [6].

[29] T. Sayed Ahmed and I. Németi, *On neat reducts of algebras of logic.* Studia Logica **68** (2001), p. 229–262.

[30] S. Shelah, *Classification theory: and the number of non-isomorphic models* Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics. (1990).